THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Rev. J. S. Whale, D.D., has done well to publish his address to this year's Annual Congress of the Free Church Federal Council—*The Old Faith and the New Order* (Independent Press; 6d.). He begins by noting two inescapable and significant facts: first, the widespread decay of the old faith by which our fathers lived and died, and second, the equally widespread demand for a new order of society. These two facts are closely connected, for decaying faith in God may partly explain and partly be explained by the confident belief that man can build a new social order. It is assumed that the old faith is irrelevant to the new order: the two are mutually exclusive. The Christian assumption, however, is the very reverse. We believe that the old faith and the new order need one another. Faith is indeed irrelevant unless it works out in a new order, but a new order will not be a better order unless it is inspired and guided by faith. The new order which men demand in the name of Christian social action must take account of the Christian doctrine of man as a sinner in need of redemption. 'Sociology without a theology will be just another blue print for Utopia. Theology without a thoroughgoing sociology will be a featherbed for a dying Church.' The main part of the address is taken up with the exposition and enforcement of these points; and, needless to say, this is done with Dr. Whale's usual clearness and searching vigour.

Dr. Temple's Penguin book, *Christianity and Social Order* (6d.) is a rich mine of material, yet its comprehensiveness in no way detracts from its orderliness and lucidity. Some readers will look first at the Appendix, where the new Archbishop of Canterbury, in his capacity as a Christian citizen, offers certain proposals for immediate action which would in his judgment lead to a more Christian ordering of society. Others, more historically-minded, will enjoy his review of the great tradition of Christian social teaching in the chapter entitled 'Has the Church claimed to intervene before?' Here we turn to other topics with the general comment that no summary can do justice to the wide knowledge and convincing argument set forth by one whose name, now more than ever before, has become linked with the very idea of Christian social progress.

What right has the Church to interfere in social matters? Dr. Temple deals with this question in a fair but forcible manner along these four lines: the claims of sympathy for those who suffer, the educational influence of the social and economic system, the challenge offered to our existing system in the name of justice, and the duty of conformity to the 'Natural Order' in which is to be found the purpose of God. Under the second of these heads, an effective reference is made to Marshall, the leading orthodox economist of last generation, who ranked the economic system with the religion of a country as the most formative influence in the moulding of a people's character. That alone is sufficient warrant for the Church to be concerned with the economic system. The Church cannot indeed claim to know what will be the purely economic effect of particular proposals, but it may declare the proper relation of the economic to the other activities of men, and must insist that economics are properly subject to a non-economic criterion.

But how should the Church interfere? In these three ways—its members must fulfil their moral responsibilities and functions in a Christian spirit; they must exercise their civic rights in a Christian spirit; and the Church must itself supply them with a systematic statement of principles to aid them in doing these two things, and this will involve a denunciation of customs or institutions in contemporary society which offend against those principles. The Archbishop's discussion of Christian social principles is brief but illuminating. These are the three that he chooses—Freedom, Fellowship, Service; and he points out that they are themselves derived from the still more fundamental Christian postulates that man is a child of God and is destined for a life of eternal fellowship with Him.

Another important and timely topic is the discussion of the idea of natural law in society. By natural law, thinkers of the Christian social

tradition meant the proper function of a human activity as apprehended by a consideration of its own nature. In the economic field, for example, the reason why goods should be produced is that men may satisfy their needs by consuming those goods. Production, according to natural law, exists for consumption. This conception, as Dr. Temple points out, is specially important because it holds together two aspects of truth, the ideal and the practical, which tend to become separated. On the one hand, we may start with a purely utopian conception of social order and wring our hands because men show little sign of fitting themselves into it; on the other hand, we may start with society as it is and try to remedy an abuse here and there with no ideal end or criterion of progress to guide us. The conception of natural law leads us to consider every activity in its relation to the whole economy of life, and so 'to grasp the vital importance of safeguarding what is indispensable while we fulfil the obligation of reaching out towards the higher ends as yet imperfectly attained.'

Finally, Dr. Temple strikes the same note as Dr. Whale when he declares that there is no hope of establishing a more Christian social order except through the labour and sacrifice of those in whom the Spirit of Christ is active, and that the first necessity is more and better Christians taking full responsibility as citizens for the political, social, and economic system under which they and their fellows live.

Many hopes and fears are built upon the new world which shall emerge beyond the war and many anxious thoughts are given to the shaping of it. A contribution of real value to the problem of the place the Faith shall occupy in the new world has been made by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., Dean of St. Paul's, in a little book, *The Foundations of Peace* (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 2s. 6d. net). His conviction is that 'the Christian faith contains the principle upon which alone a peaceful and properly progressive society can be built. We have to show, not merely that the Christian religion is something which ought to be allowed to exist, but that it is something without which civilization itself in any tolerable form cannot continue to exist.'

His treatment of this subject is marked by what he would call Christian realism. He is a shrewd observer of current events and brings to the study of the present crisis not only sound Christian principles but robust and sanctified common sense. He is keenly alive to the danger of a sentimental idealism which refuses to face the hard facts. In this connexion he recalls a service held in the old Cathedral in Utrecht in connexion with the Œcumenical Movement, at which speeches were made, full of glowing hopes for some indefinite future, while a few miles away German armies were massed on the frontier. 'There was a tacit agreement not to mention this unpleasant circumstance.' And so the storm broke upon these amiable dreamers.

The first question we have to put if we are to come to grips with our problem is, What kind of world will it be for which a peace must be found? When we face the situation squarely we find that there are certain factors of a most disturbing kind which threaten to render all efforts at peacemaking incredibly difficult. Foremost among these is 'the mountainous hatred which is accumulating hour by hour in every part of Europe. . . . We learn more about the realities of our world by talking to a Pole or a Czech who has lost all his relations and friends and every tie in life, and lives only for revenge.' In this hatred, moreover, there are complications and cross-currents. 'There is nothing to be gained by hiding the truth that the hatred for Russia in many parts of Europe is intense. The memories of the past two years in Finland, the Baltic States and parts of Poland will not easily be effaced.' And what of Germany itself? There is talk of re-educating the Germans, but how will it be possible to conduct a school for sixty million refractory pupils who must at the same time be forcibly held down? In short, we must face the danger of a peace of revenge and of a bitter aftermath of reprisals, executions, massacres, revolutions.

Add to this the decay of mutual confidence between men and nations which has arisen through the collapse of trust in treaties and agreements. This is the most obvious symptom of the deep moral corruption of our civilization. 'The barbarian code condemns the breaking of treaties and oaths, which are under the protection of the gods; the violator of covenants in the ethics even of savages is the most degraded of beings.' But our modern world has sunk far below this. 'It seems evident that the peace which follows on the armistice will have to be an imposed peace and maintained by force. No rational being could regard this as satisfactory or likely to endure, and the task of the future will be to transform the peace imposed into a peace by agreement.' We must still further face the fact that the world's economic situation at the end of the war will be appalling.

Such, in brief, is the situation as Dean MATTHEWS sees it, and he has much to say about it which is both wise and Christian, and to the point. He deals with such topics as the Vocation of the British Empire, the Future of the great Nations which will be the Pillars of the World, the Problem of Germany, the Elements of Value in the League of Nations, and the Movements towards Internationalism. He is not of those enthusiastic architects of a brave new world who seem to assume that the New Testament contains precise directions for the construction of national and international society and that all we need is a determination to put the plan into practice.

But there are certain great Christian principles which have an application in political as well as in private life, and which must control our efforts at peacemaking if these efforts are to be fruitful and of enduring value. One of these is the supreme value of human personality, a principle which 'grows directly out of two Christian dogmas, that God created all men to be His children, and that Christ died for all men that they might be restored to the relation of sonship which they had lost.' Strike away the Christian basis and man becomes a mere economic unit of varying value to the greater unit of the State of which he is but an insignificant fragment. There is also the principle of justice which on one side of it is retributive. 'In spite of all the sophistical arguments which may be brought against him, the plain man believes that it is right for the criminal to be visited with punishment.' But this natural sense of justice may easily be perverted, as when reasons of State are made the supreme law. The ideal of justice needs to be founded on and safeguarded by the Christian doctrine of a righteous God who has given His holy and unalterable laws for the guidance and restraint of men. Finally, there is the principle of Christian love and goodwill to all, including enemies. Christian teaching about love and forgiveness of enemies, far from being impracticable idealism, is strictly relevant to the task of the statesman, for an enemy is never truly vanquished until by some means he is changed into a friend. 'The great and abiding principle which is laid down by the Lord is that we should never allow the enemy to overcome our spirits to such a degree that we cease to love him and forget the bond which unites all the children of men. Though he may be filled with hate, we must resolve that he shall not reduce us to his level. We are to desire his good. But what is that good? Surely not that he may continue in his hatred and aggression, but that he should be stopped in his mad career of self-aggression and be brought into fellowship.'

The Bishop of Chelmsford's book, *It Can Happen Here!* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), will provoke controversy. It certainly provokes thought, and it ought to stir the conscience. Some people will say it is pessimistic and discouraging. But it certainly compels one to face realities. And its aim is purely positive. In the author's own words the main contention is that the vital force in a nation is faith, and that as faith dies, energy, enthusiasm, ideals and clear purpose all begin to wane. Nothing can take its place, nothing can brace the will of a nation, unify it and inspire it to great tasks but that peculiar quality which religion alone can give.

But that is precisely what Dr. WILSON finds wanting in our nation. One of the most definite assertions in the book is that the Christian religion has lost its power over the lives of all but a small minority of our people. About ten per cent may be counted religious. About ninety per cent may be regarded as pagan. But of course, it is said, that applies only to church members. There is a great deal of Christianity outside the churches. Christianity has abandoned the Church to find a dwelling place among people who have no use for priests or ministers.

But the Bishop will have none of this. The kind of thing that masquerades as non-ecclesiastical Christianity has no resemblance to Christianity at all. It is a vague belief in some kind of God who is good natured and infinitely tolerant; a vague admiration for Christ with the proviso that nobody can be expected to live up to His ideals; and a note of interrogation about the future, assuming that if there *is* a future everything will be all right for everybody. What is demanded of us is a certain kind of decency in the conduct of life. That is very much the attitude of those who make any pretence of a religion at all. The multitude does not bother with any such profession.

There is a very dark account in this book of our real condition as a nation, including the decay of the family, the alienation of the Lord's Day from all serious purposes, the widespread corruption of morals and the alarming lawlessness of youth. In a note Dr. WILSON writes that in 1913 there were 577 divorces; in 1939 there were 7955; and the new Divorce Act has still to make itself felt. The point Dr. WILSON makes is that to a very large extent we are actually a pagan country. In one respect we are behind and below the Germans. For Hitler has given to Germany a real religion. It is pagan. It is degrading. It negates all we hold dear.

But it is a religion, fanatically received and devotedly pursued.

But the Bishop's purpose is not merely to paint a black picture of our condition. He believes we may recover, and he points in his last chapter to 'the way of recovery.' What, he asks, can the Christian Church do to fortify and advance the Christian front? In answer he suggests three things. First, let us realize fearlessly the facts of the case. The Church is the Society of Jesus Christ in a non-Christian land. The implications of this are far-reaching. The Church is no longer an institution nourishing the religious life of a Christian nation. In reality it is a missionary Church called to evangelize a non-Christian land. And as such the whole system of Church activities calls for a complete overhauling. We need not a revival but the conversion of the nation.

What is called for is parish evangelism, the preaching of Christ to the heathen among us, the winning of the multitudes who are outside not only the churches but all religious influence. In this connexion Dr. WILSON urges the holding of 'a simple, evangelistic, non-liturgical service on Sunday evenings.' 'The Book of Common Prayer is perfectly suited to a trained Christian but it is a deterrent to the non-churchgoer,' he says. But in addition to this there should be persistent visitation of each parish to bring outsiders into contact with the gospel. Evangelism first and last should be the watchword of the Church.

Secondly, there is a great need for a popular and persistent defence of the Christian religion. The B.B.C. has done fine work in this region. But the addresses, able and persuasive as they were, did not meet the case. They were too high-brow. They did not suit the common man. Indeed only a small percentage would understand them. It is something quite different that is needed, to counter the vague impression that is abroad, that science has exploded religion and criticism has undermined the Bible. What is needed is something very simple, done by men who will carry weight and who know how to reach the mass mind.

Finally, there are the children, the hope of the new world, the future citizens who will live in it. We must keep the children. And the Church must address herself to this task. She is not doing it. Of all her activities this is the least regarded. What is needed is a system, a carefully considered system, by which all children now in the Church will be kept, and trained, and taught and won for Christ and His cause. The Church might abandon almost everything else to do this work. Instruction, influence, personal touch, interest, every force at her command should be brought to bear on youth to secure for the future a Christianized generation. This is the Bishop's last word, and it is his greatest.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

To many households in ancient Palestine, faced, as the inhabitants still are, with a dry season of several months every year and very few perennial streams, water was always a matter of serious concern. Not only the cultivation of the ground, but the maintenance of human life and the sustenance of the flocks depended on an adequate supply. Some towns for this reason were built on the banks of rivers. Thus, *Tell Jerišeh* (not yet identified with any Biblical locality) lies in a bend of the Jaffa River, and Beth-shean (*Beisan*) was situated on the Jalûd stream, though in the latter case any advantage gained was considerably reduced by the fact that the site lay about sixty-five yards above the water and necessitated a long detour to reach it. But even the ground on the banks of a river was not always suitable. The thickets, for instance, of the Zôr (the depressed plain through which the Jordan flows) were generally uninhabitable owing to being periodically inundated by the rising of the river, and some parts bordering on the streams in the Maritime and Philistine plains were marshy and insalubrious. The reason, indeed, why *Tell el-'Ajjûl* (ancient Gaza according to Petrie) was abandoned by its inhabitants (about 2000 B.C.) was probably due to the unhealthy exhalations of the *Wadi Ghazzeh*.

Springs.—The proximity of a reliable spring of water was an undoubted benefit. Given such a spring, a settlement as a rule took place adjoining it, undeterred by the poor economic nature of the environs, and it was generally in this way that

cities began. Probably it was a neolithic settlement around the Virgin's Fountain, in the Kidron Valley, that developed into the earliest Jerusalem. Fortunately, some parts of Palestine are specially rich in these natural sources (cf. Dt 8^{7}), a fact which is apparent from the large number of Biblical place-names composed with *'Ain* (construct *'En*) 'spring,' such as *'En-rogel*, *'En-gedi*, *'En-dôr*, *'En-misphat*, etc. Many such natural sources, amounting at first sometimes to a mere percolation of water, could be considerably improved after a little trouble. Steps could be taken to increase the outflow and give it better direction by enlarging the chalky limestone fissures through which the water trickled and practically turning these into tunnels, which were sometimes of considerable length. Any surplus water, apart from the domestic supply, was drained off by canals for the irrigation of the orchards, gardens, and agricultural plots. In this way the whole supply was used to its last drop, and it was only indeed in time of heavy showers that there was a real abundance for the cultivated ground.

The spring was usually situated at the bottom of the rocky scarp or slope on which a town was built. The work of drawing and carrying the water for domestic use fell almost exclusively to the women (cf. Gn $24^{11.\ 13}$, Ex 2^{16}, 1 S 9^{11}, Jn 4^{7}), and hence the unusual circumstance of a *man* bearing a pitcher of water (Mk 14^{13}) enabled the two disciples to recognize their guide. This duty involved the women in a long and tedious journey daily; and their return uphill, walking erect under the heavy burden of their jar or urging their loaded ass onward, must have been an arduous task. The road down to the water and the precincts of the spring itself formed a scene of particular animation morning and evening, and the opportunities for gossip and familiar talk no doubt amply repaid the toil.

As the chief *desiderata* of a town in ancient Palestine included defence as well as water, one grave danger lay in the fact that such defence could not be secured at the spring, which was generally on low ground outside the fortified enclosure and might be seized by the enemy—a common stratagem in ancient warfare. The town, being thus reduced to water collected in cisterns, might speedily be forced to surrender. Jehoshaphat and his allies adopted this plan against the Moabites (2 K $3^{19.25}$), and Holophernes in besieging Bethulia 'took the springs and set garrisons of men of war over them' (Jth 7^{7}). Hezekiah, when besieged by Sennacherib, managed to reverse this operation and to deprive the besiegers of water, while securing it for the besieged (2 Ch $32^{3.4}$). The moderate height of Jericho above the plain allowed the Hyksos rulers there to enclose the spring within the defences. At first no doubt, before the place became a 'town' surrounded with walls, this vital source lay outside the limits of the settlement, but in later ages under the Hyksos regime (from about 1750 to 1600 B.C.), when the town attained its greatest extension, occupying about nine acres (nearly the size of contemporary Jerusalem), the entire water-supply was enclosed within the circuit of the ramparts.[1]

It is an old and widespread belief in Palestine (and in all Semitic countries) that springs and similar 'living waters' are inhabited by divine or demoniac powers. Many traces of this belief have been preserved in the Old Testament and in the popular religion of Syria and Palestine at the present day. The belief has probably arisen from the fact that such waters, in their origin and flow, are a mystery to the oriental mind, and are easily credited with supernatural power. In many cases they are considered to be the actual property of the indwelling *numen* or spirit, who carefully guards them, and this idea of ownership has found expression in some of the Old Testament names. Thus, we find *'En-dôr*, 'spring of dwelling' (Jos 17^{11}, 1 S 28^{7}, etc.); *Ba'al-peraṣim*, 'owner of the outflow' (2 S 5^{20}, 1 Ch 14^{11}); *Ba'al-hamôn*, 'owner of the torrent' (Ca 8^{11}). Some springs, as their names show, were believed to be guarded by animals, such as *'En-'eglaïm*, 'spring of the two calves' (Ezk 47^{10}); *'En-gedi*, spring of the kid' (Jos 15^{62}, 1 S 23^{29}, Ca 1^{14}, etc.); *'En-haḳḳôrê*, 'spring of the partridge' (Ju 15^{19}); *'En-hattanîn*, 'spring of the dragon' (Neh 2^{13}). At *'En-rogel*, near Jerusalem (2 S 17^{17}, 1 K 1^{9}, etc.) there was a 'serpent stone'—the serpent (*zoheleth*) being regarded by the Semites as a sacred creature, and here Adonijah held a sacrificial feast. Such ideas were one of the characteristic features of polydemonism, so prevalent in the old Semitic nomad religion.[2]

Wells.—The inadequateness of springs at a great number of sites, the absence of them in the Negeb or southern regions, and their rarity in the Philistine plain, necessitated the digging of wells. The Hebrew word for 'well' (*be'êr*, Arabic *bîr*) signifies, properly speaking, a *spring* of water, in other words a *living* well, *i.e.* one in which the water rises more or less quickly in spite of constant usage, as opposed to a mere rain-collecting pit (*bôr*). Hence the words *be'êr* and *'aïn* are interchangeable in some Old Testament passages. In Gn 24, for instance, where we read of the meeting of Rebecca with Eliezer, both words occur without any distinction between

[1] J. Garstang, *The Story of Jericho*, 93.

[2] Cf. T. Canaan, *Haunted Springs and Water Demons in Palestine* (1922).

them; and *'En-rogel*, if it be identified (as most scholars believe) with the spring at the junction of the Hinnom and Kidron Valleys, is known to-day as *Bir-Ayûb*.[1]

These artificial sources, usually strengthened with a shaft of masonry, were often covered over with a large flat stone as a precaution against accident (cf. Ex 21^{33}), and sometimes sand or earth was strewn over the cover to prevent enemies detecting them (cf. 2 S 17^{19}) and stopping them up (Gn 26^{15}, 2 K $3^{19.\ 25}$). Some dwelling-houses had their own private well, as at Bahurim where we read of one in the courtyard (2 S 17^{18}), but as a rule towns had their public well, and this had necessarily to be sunk in the lower part, on the outskirts (leading unfortunately to the same danger as a spring in the case of war). It was an extremely laborious and uncertain undertaking to dig a well on higher ground inside the town. It meant the removal of a considerable depth of soil and probably rock, and was rarely attempted. At Lachish (*Tell Duweir*) the excavators discovered a large well on the north-east extremity of the town, under the protection of the rampart. Even at this moderate level it had a depth of about 120 feet, and at least 85 feet had been sunk through rock. Jacob's Well (Gn $33^{18ff.}$, Jn $4^{5ff.}$), which lies just outside the eastern end of the town of Nablus (Shechem), below the little village of Sychar (*Tulûl Balâṭah*), is one of the best authenticated sites in Palestine. All Christian, Jewish, and Moslem traditions support it. The mouth of the well is cut out of one stone (now disfigured by an unsightly contrivance of iron for drawing up water), and is probably the original mouth. The diameter of the well is nine feet, and its depth about eighty, though in ancient times it was certainly much deeper (cf. Jn 4^{11}). A Byzantine Church, which was erected over it, gave way to a Crusaders' one, on whose ruins a modern Orthodox Church has recently been constructed.

Many of the ancient Palestinian towns probably had no springs, and consequently no other source of water than the public well. This seems to have been the case with some of those on the central ridge, such as *Beit Mirsim* (Debir), *Tell Zakariyah* (Azekah), and *Tell eṣ-ṣâfy* (Gath or Libnah ?), as well as most of the Philistine towns, and the sites on some of the larger *wadis* such as the *Wadi Ghazzeh*. At *Tell el-'Ajjûl*, on this *wadi*, Petrie laid bare a large well, lined with masonry, in the southern outskirts of the town. Probably many 'suburban' wells of this kind might have been discovered at Palestinian sites, but excavators have not as a rule sought for them. Such sources at the very most only sufficed for the maintenance of 'man and beast,' with the result that places which possessed perennial springs generally had beautiful well-irrigated gardens and cultivated plots, while those dependent on wells had no such attractions.

The water was drawn up by hand, by means of a goat-skin bucket (*dĕli*, Nu 24^{7}, Is 40^{15}, cf. verb in Ex $2^{16.\ 19}$)—the mouth of which was kept open with two wooden cross-bars—or by means of an earthenware pitcher or jar suitable for carrying on the shoulder (*kad*, Gn $24^{14ff.}$, 1 K 18^{33} [wrongly translated 'barrels' here], Ec 12^{6}; cf. Mk 14^{13}, κεράμιον). For the use of cattle the water was poured into a trough (*raḥaṭ*, Gn $30^{38.\ 41}$, Ex 2^{16}; *shoḳeth*, Gn 24^{20} 30^{38}). Most of the Bedouin and fellaḥs still draw water in this way, and the ropes in the course of many generations have formed deep grooves in the stone edges of the wells. There is no evidence in ancient Palestine of the use of the windlass for the purpose, worked by hand or animal traction, although such a method may have been in existence. Nor is there any mention in the Old Testament of the *shadûf* or 'balance-pole,' which was in use at wells in Egypt and Babylonia from early times, and which Sennacherib introduced into Assyria to draw water from the Tigris for his irrigation plans. It is only later on, in Hellenistic times, that we find water-wheels or other contrivances (such as *norias*) in use in Palestine. According to allusions in the Mishna, some of the reservoirs connected with the Second Temple were provided with water-raising apparatus of this nature. In Egypt the vertical wheel at some wells was moved by the foot, and this is thought by some scholars to explain the allusion in Dt 11^{10}.

Several place-names in the Old Testament are compounded with *Be'êr*, and some of them (like those with *'Aïn*) are based on mythological ideas. The precise meaning of the names is doubtful in some cases. *Be'êr-sheba'*, usually taken to be 'Well of the Covenant,' may possibly mean 'Well of the Seven' [spirits or 'numina'], for it was regarded as a sacred place, and in the time of Amos at least was a favourite resort of pilgrims (Am 5^{5} 8^{14}) who worshipped its *numen*. Similarly, *Be'êr-laḥai-rôi*, which was the scene of Hagar's theophany, and which signifies 'Well of the Living One that seeth me' (Gn 16^{14} 21^{19} 24^{62} 25^{11}), seems to have been an ancient shrine or sacred spot. *Be'êr-êlîm* (Is 15^{8}, cf. Nu 33^{9}), usually translated 'Well of terebinths,' should probably be rendered 'Well of gods or mighty spirits' (cf. *êlîm*, Ex 15^{11}, Job 41^{25}, Ps 89^{6}, etc.). *Ba'alath be'êr*, signifying 'Mistress of the well' (Jos 19^{8}), was evidently a place supposed to be owned and haunted by a female spirit. In later times, when Moses brought the Hebrews from the desert to the Transjordan

[1] Similarly, the Greek φρέαρ 'well' and πηγή 'spring' are used indifferently for Jacob's well in Jn 4.

plateau, Yahweh, we read, pointed out to him where water could be found, and in Nu $21^{17.\ 18}$ we have an old fragment of Hebrew poetry, giving the actual song of the well-sinkers, which was probably accompanied with music and dancing in honour of the divine owner :

> Spring up, O well ; sing ye unto it :
> The well, which the princes digged,
> Which the nobles of the people delved,
> With the sceptre, [and] with their staves.

Canaanite Tomb at *Yazur* (Azor).

The Department of Antiquities in Palestine reports that, while a workman was quarrying on the 'Dabbagha' track which runs immediately south of *Yazur* village (about five miles south-east of Jaffa), he discovered a rock-cut tomb of the shaft-grave type. As *Yazur* has been identified with Azor of the Septuagint in Jos 19^{45} (the *Azzuri* of the Sennacherib inscriptions), it lay within the territory (north-west of Judah) allocated at the Conquest to the tribe of Dan. We have no information as to how long the territory was occupied by the Danites. The Amorite population prevented them from maintaining a hold there, and pushed them back into the hills between Ephraim and Judah, and ultimately circumstances (probably connected with the Philistine advent) forced the greater part of the tribe to migrate to the extreme north, where they settled at Laish. But the tomb referred to is interesting from two or three points of view. *First*, it clearly belongs to an ancient cemetery, for a number of similar graves are stated to have been discovered near it some time ago. According to the contents, it must be assigned to the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age (*c.* 2000 B.C.). Thus, for centuries before the Danites occupied the district, and no doubt at the time of their invasion, there must have been a fairly large Canaanite settlement at Azor. We know that all along the road (a very ancient one) from Gaza to Jaffa there were many Bronze Age towns and villages, as evidenced by the sites at Ashdod, Jebna, Abu Sultan, 'Ayun Qara, Jaffa, and other places. We need not be surprised that the influences against the invading Danites were so powerful. *Second*, the type of tomb in the form of a shaft-grave is not common in Palestine, though some specimens have been discovered at other sites, such as Gezer, Mizpah (*Tell en-Nasbeh*), and Jericho. Such graves consist of a perpendicular shaft, square or circular, several feet wide at the mouth, and going down about six feet or more through the rock. The shaft narrows as it deepens, and from the bottom an entrance, covered with a large stone slab, leads into a grotto or vaulted chamber also rock-hewn. At Gezer a tomb of this nature was found, with a shaft eight feet deep and over six feet in diameter, leading into a chamber (almost circular) about eleven feet wide. At Megiddo, one was discovered with a shaft twenty-six feet deep and a chamber about eight feet across. In general, the earliest burial-places in Palestine were simply natural caves, the mouths of which were blocked with large stones, and it does not appear that any more suitable tombs existed before the rise of the Hebrew monarchy, at which time we find small chambers set apart for the purpose, with a couple of benches in the wall. The tombs of the kings of Judah, so far as authentic evidence goes, still remain undiscovered at Jerusalem. *Third*, the tomb at *Yazur*, like many others, was found to have its furniture, consisting of two jars, a lamp with four nozzles, some bronze weapons or implements (now in fragments), and thirteen carnelian beads. As it was supposed that the future life was simply a continuance of the life here—a belief prevalent among the Egyptians, Canaanites, and Babylonians—the usual necessities of life, such as food, drink, ornaments, and other possessions, were buried with the body. Tombs were believed to be the dwelling-place of the departed spirit,[1] but in this respect the Palestine ones came far short of those in Egypt, which contained painted decorations of life in this world and the next, as well as interesting inscriptions recording the activities of the departed and his faith in his gods.

Ancient Catacombs in Palestine.

Revelations of later Jewish burial customs have come to light within the last four or five years in catacombs of hitherto unknown type discovered by Dr. B. Maisler (Jewish Palestine Exploration Society) on the slope of the mountains in western Galilee, at *Sheikh Ibreiq*, the ancient Beth-She'ârîm (the Greek Besara), frequently mentioned in Rabbinical literature.[2] The catacombs are large and numerous, and range in date from the second to the fourth century A.D. Discoveries show that they formed a select burial-place for the Jews of Palestine and of the Diaspora during the first centuries. It is known that Beth-She'arim became the cultural centre of the Jews and the seat of the Sanhedrin after the destruction of the Second Temple, and to this place were evidently brought the bodies of distinguished Jewish people from many parts of the Near East, including

[1] Cf. J. G. Duncan, *Digging up Biblical History*, ii. 168.

[2] B. Maisler, *The Excavations at Sheikh Ibreiq*, 1936–37, Jerusalem, 1938 ; B. Maisler and Schwabe, *The Excavations at Beth Shearim*, Jerusalem, Jewish Palestine Explor. Society, 1939.

Palmyra and Arabia, and even from as far west as Italy. The catacombs are ranged in several stories. One large one, enclosing some 400 tombs, is composed of a corridor—as most of them are—about twenty-eight yards long, cut out of the solid rock, from which access is gained into nearly a score of halls. The doors into these halls, with their jambs, sills, and lintels, are all of stone, made as a rule in imitation of wood. Most of them are still *in situ*, and some still revolve in their sockets. The halls vary in size, one being as much as forty-six feet long, and some being ten feet or more in height, and as a rule they contain several chambers which are divided from each other by arches, supported in some cases by rock-cut columns with ornamented bases and capitals. The most common type of burial in them is the *arcosolium*, which consists of a niche in the rock, with a vaulted roof, but there are also *loculi* (small recesses) here and there and shafts in the floor. A large number of interesting objects have been found, among which are lamps, beads, finger-rings, bracelets, pottery, glass, cosmetic articles, and coins.

Perhaps the most interesting feature is the fact that the walls and ceilings are decorated with various paintings, drawings, reliefs, and *graffiti*, not unlike the famous synagogue frescoes at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates. The most common pictures are those of the seven-branched candlestick (which appears in some thirty different types), the Torah-shrine (the Ark of the Law), the shofar (ram's horn), the rosette, the oil-jar, and bowls containing fruit and flowers, but there are also numerous human figures, animals, plants, ships (including the boat of Charon), and geometric designs.

A noteworthy feature is the wealth of epigraphic material. There are many inscriptions in Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Palmyrene, some of them bilingual. Most of them are quite short, but many run into several lines. In one catacomb alone 114 have been found, consisting of 84 in Greek, 23 in Hebrew, and 7 in Palmyrene. Some are incised in the rock while others are painted in red, black, or green, on lintels, walls, covering slabs, and elsewhere. The majority of the names are Biblical, with titles like 'rabbi' and 'elder' added to some of them.

Dr. Maisler has also discovered on the north-east part of the hill the foundations of a synagogue, basilican in form, and 'oriented' towards Jerusalem. It appears to have flourished most during the third century A.D., when a large settlement existed on the hill, and to have been destroyed about the middle of the fourth. So far as archæological evidence goes, it is the earliest synagogue found in Palestine, for the very interesting one excavated at Capernaum is not, as some have supposed, the one in which Jesus preached and healed, but must be dated at least two centuries later than His time. An inscription found at Jerusalem records the building of what seems to have been the 'Synagogue of the Libertines' (Ac 6[9]), in the earliest days of the Christian Church, but the inscribed stone is the only surviving relic of the structure. No doubt Titus, when he destroyed the temple at Jerusalem, also razed most of the synagogues to the ground, while Hadrian, in his devastation after the rebellion of Bar Cochba in the second century, seems to have demolished the remainder. As for Christian churches, the earliest yet excavated is the one found at Dura-Europos, but it only dates from the third century and was merely a room in a private house, consecrated and furnished as a chapel.

Literature.

S. KIERKEGAARD.

Dr. Walter Lowrie, of Princeton University, has earned the gratitude of many students of philosophical and religious thought by not only producing a substantial biography (which is largely an autobiography) of Kierkegaard but also translating a full dozen of the works of that 'tremendous little Dane.'

Until now these translations have been of works belonging to the 'religious period' of Kierkegaard's literary activity. It is the period initiated by the 'Concluding Unscientific Postscript' (1846), in which, still preserving pseudonymity, he sets forth the practical implications of a Christian confession of faith, at the same time affirming that Christianity is based upon the grand paradox—which the 'System' of Hegel cannot resolve—of the Eternal having entered into the relations of Time. It is also the period of greatest significance in the life of Kierkegaard, in respect of his influence upon subsequent thought.

But in the volume now before us, *Stages on Life's Way* (Milford; 30s. net), Dr. Lowrie, with commendable zeal and enthusiasm, presses behind the 'religious period' to that first or early period in which Kierkegaard seeks by the method of 'indirect communication,' and in the spirit of the Socratic 'irony,' to expose the ignorance and insincerity of the contemporary religion. His

writings in this period are, quite naturally, pseudonymous; and the period itself is known as the 'æsthetic period,' because in it the ground of his strictures upon the contemporary religion is that it largely lives and moves on the plane of sense.

It is worth observing that 'Stages on Life's Way' (1845), as dealing in succession with the spheres of the æsthetic, the moral, and the religious, may be taken as a summary of significant works that preceded it. And it illustrates the pseudonymity that went hand in hand with the 'indirect communication,' that the editor of these 'studies by sundry persons' is 'Hilarius Bookbinder'; that the æsthetic sphere—represented by '*In Vino Veritas*' (modelled on Plato's 'Symposium')—is dealt with by 'William Afham'; that the moral sphere—represented by 'Various Observations about Marriage'—is entrusted to 'A Married Man'; and that the religious sphere—represented by 'Guilty?, not Guilty?'—appears under the pseudonym of '*Frater Taciturnus*.' This third section of the work, in which the subject of the story is led towards true religion, is regarded as the most important.

There is much in Kierkegaard, especially in the works of the 'æsthetic period,' that is hard to understand, and much that is tiresomely discursive (though relieved and enlivened now and then by references to the classics and modern literature); and such features are apt to be accentuated in translation. But undoubtedly it is necessary to study the works of the 'æsthetic period' if we are to appreciate the process of mental development that culminated in the Kierkegaard, the man of sheer religious genius, who has become so great an inspiration in recent theology.

W. Fulton.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE BIBLE.

The publication of a new book in present conditions can be justified only on one of two grounds; either it must be a really important contribution to scholarship, or it must meet the needs of men and women who are in want of help or guidance for to-day. *The Relevance of the Bible*, by Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., B.Litt. (James Clarke; 6s. net), emphatically fulfils the second of these demands. Dr. Rowley is keenly aware of the urgent relevance of the Bible to the situation in which we find ourselves, and we have to thank him for giving us this series of illustrations. At first glance some readers may be disappointed to find that in some chapters there appears to be no reference to war conditions, but in others, especially towards the end of the book, the practical application is expressly given to us. It must be remembered that this is not, strictly speaking, an *ad hoc* book, and if Dr. Rowley had set out to construct a volume which should have direct reference to the state of the world to-day, we should probably have had some things expressed in a rather different form. The book is a collection of addresses, lectures, and articles produced at different times during the last five years, and the author is to be congratulated on the way in which he has achieved a real succession and continuity of thought.

The first two chapters, on the changing emphasis in Biblical studies and the inspiration of the Bible, are preliminary, and both are marked by a welcome combination of scholarship and devotion. Dr. Rowley not merely avoids the dangers of barren learning on the one hand and of unintelligent pietism on the other; he gives us positive guidance as to the meaning of Scripture and the place it should take in the spiritual life. His summary of the modern attitude towards the Prophets is wholly admirable, and shows in clear and concise fashion exactly the right way in which to interpret them. In view of the tendency to isolate the New Testament and to regard the Old Testament as more or less irrelevant, the chapter on the unity of the Bible is both adequate and timely. Chapter V, dealing with the use of the Bible, is, perhaps, the real centre of the book. It includes a sane and yet devout discussion of miracle, and touches on other problems. There is, in particular, a short passage on the Book of Daniel such as probably only Dr. Rowley could have written. Throughout the whole of this chapter we have expressly stated a truth which does, as a matter of fact, run through the whole book; the Bible must be studied from a literary point of view, but equally must be treated as the medium of a divine message, not only to the contemporaries of the various writers, but for all time. The last three chapters are devoted especially to the theology of the Bible, and, though Dr. Rowley's specialist studies lie outside the realm of dogmatic theology, he is able to offer a satisfactory and simple statement of the points he selects. In describing the God of the Bible he does explicitly bring Scripture teaching into close connexion with the events which are taking place around us, and the chapter on sin, too, is directly and effectively pointed. Finally, the hope of the future is indicated when Dr. Rowley discusses the person and work of Christ, and the whole book is, in a sense, summed up in the closing sentence: 'It is for the Church corporately to seek to bring the corporate life of the world to the recreating spring of the Crucified Redeemer.'

T. H. Robinson.

THE PROBLEM OF THE JEW.

The authors of *The Jew in the Christian World*, Herr Hans Kosmala and the Rev. Robert Smith, B.D. (S.C.M.; 6s. net), make it abundantly clear that 'The Jewish Problem' is one, not of economics or politics or of toleration but, of religion. With all respect to Herr Kosmala the Jews are not a nation. They never have been since Bible times. The Jew in Britain is British, in Russia Russian, in Poland Polish. What holds all Jews together is their faith. Moreover, what makes the Jewish problem so difficult is that the faith of the Jew is as absolute as that of the Christian. The Christian holds that the truth he believes is a divine and final revelation. The Jew believes the same of his faith. And this universalism, this claim to

finality, is not lost in modern 'liberal' Judaism. The Jewish religion has never been a missionary one, but there has been a revival in modern Judaism of the absolutist claim and an assurance that the Jewish religion will be the final one.

The authors consider, however, that the motive behind 'Zionism' is mainly political, using that word in a broad sense. Mr. Smith says that it is to the Jew what the mystical Third Reich is for the National Socialist—a satisfaction of national dignity. The religious element is not absent, but it is not the determining factor. The Jew wishes a focus for his renewed nationalist aspiration. And this raises what Mr. Smith calls the dilemma of Zionism. If the Jew is to establish in Palestine a national home, and become a nation, what is to be said of the twelve odd millions elsewhere? Are the one million Jews, the limit of what Palestine could maintain, to be the Jewish nation, with their own citizenship, political machinery, armed forces? And the other twelve million to be fragments of this nationality? And if all Biblical Palestine is to be Jewish, what of the Arabs and their very reasonable claims? The Jews have never been an easy people, and, in spite of their sufferings, have never been distinguished for the grace of gratitude. They are never what the Scots call 'blate.' But the statesmen on whom will be laid the task of thinking out the post-war world will have to consider many things besides the uncompromising Jewish demands. And to the Jew it will certainly be given that wherever he is he will enjoy freedom to pursue his own ways of life and worship, and, if there is such a thing as Jewish 'culture,' that also.

Mr. Smith, in a penetrating study of the problem on all its sides, suggests that the Christian answer is the Spirit of Jesus alive in the Universal Church. Jesus offers to the Jew a renewal of his life, and of all that belongs to his heritage as a Jew. But He also offers him deliverance from separateness, from the 'deadening curse of exclusiveness.' Jesus has opened the way for him to fellowship with people of other races. It is the hope of every Christian that this will be the destiny of Jewry.

This book is one of the ablest and most suggestive studies of the Jewish problem that has appeared for some time. Dr. William Paton, who introduces it, tells us that Herr Kosmala is a German Christian of Polish descent. He was head of the *Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* at Leipzig and Vienna, and is now resident in this country. Mr. Smith is a missionary of the Church of Scotland who for some time worked in Prague and is a leader in the department of the International Missionary Council known as 'the Christian approach to the Jew.' F. J. Rae.

A second and enlarged edition has been published of *Should We Pray for the Departed?*, by the Rev. William White, M.A., B.D. (Allenson; 1s. net). The enlargement, which contains more reading matter than the original pamphlet, consists of replies to criticisms and extracts from reviews and letters favourable to the views advocated in the book. The subject is one on which much has been written on both sides and one feels that the present writer, in his eagerness to score points, is not always quite fair in stating the view of those who differ from him. Where the mystery is so profound confident affirmations seem strangely out of place. The writer does not seem to be aware how very far his imaginative pictures of life in the world to come go beyond the reticence of Scripture and how deeply they are coloured by the evolutionary thought of the nineteenth century.

Towards a Theocracy, by the Rev. John Kennedy, B.D., Ph.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), is a timely book. The writer's thesis is that social and national reconstruction after the War must be built on a distinctively religious and Christian foundation. 'Democracy for its own internal healthiness has made too many concessions to agnosticism, and needs to acquire once again, more clearly than it does, through all its institutional life its dependence on the Christian faith.' There is nothing in the book that is new. Indeed it may be said that the social implications of Christianity have been vigorously preached for a generation, and we have now come to the time when we look for practical guidance and definitely constructive work. Here is the crucial point at which the present writer and other writers and preachers before him all seem to come to a stand. It does not carry us far to insist on 'religious values integrating themselves in the activities of society.' Those to whom such appeals have so often been made are now asking, as the soldiers asked John the Baptist, 'What shall we do?' No doubt, however, the general mind of the Church needs continually to be stirred by exhortations to action, and it may be that the accumulating pressure of such exhortations will bring to the birth a practical policy. Dr. Kennedy has spoken his message with clearness, precision and force.

'Those who make Christ real to other men do more than write about Him. They act Him. There is no truth of which the writer is more deeply conscious than that. It is to stress it that these pages are written.' So Mr. Joseph McCulloch describes his book, *The Divine Drama*, an essay in imaginative living (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The author is convinced that action not thought is the vital thing, and quotes Professor Macmurray: 'The reality of human life is action, not thought.' This is demonstrably untrue, for thought is at the back of every action and every form of activity. But this does not in any way detract from the value of this admirable 'essay.' Mr. McCulloch's reflections are given the form of the metaphor suggested by the title. Life is a drama. God is the author. But He needs the players, and each of us has his part in the working out of the main divine idea. It is difficult

sometimes to keep to the figure, but in the main the writer manages to say what is in his mind under the form he has selected. It is all good, sound thinking, and in every way edifying.

Personalities of the Passion, by the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), is 'a devotional study of some of the characters who played a part in the drama of Christ's Passion and Resurrection.' The substance of the book was given in Lenten addresses in the City Temple, and they were the last to be preached there, as the church was destroyed by bombs in the week following Easter Sunday 1941. There are twelve studies in all and they are done with the fine imagination and psychological insight which we associate with the writer's work. At times they may verge on the sentimental but they are certainly vivid character sketches and they make the narrative most luminous and interesting. They do more; they press home upon the reader the gospel lessons in a very intimate and appealing way.

Of *St. Paul and His Letters*, by the Rev. Canon Anthony C. Deane (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), the writer says, 'The aim of this book is to assist the ordinary man or woman, who is neither a theologian nor a technical student of the New Testament, to read a Pauline Epistle with pleasure and intelligence, not with a full grasp of all its details, but with a clear view of its main purpose, special character, and arrangement.' It may be said at once and without hesitation that this aim has been duly fulfilled. Canon Deane, as we should expect, has done his work to admiration. After a long and most informative chapter on St. Paul and a shorter but no less valuable chapter on his letters, the bulk of the book is given to an analysis of the letters in detail. There is first a brief explanatory introduction to each letter and then the substance of the letter itself is rendered in a free paraphrase. The whole forms a book which will charm every thoughtful reader and, what is of more importance, will reveal to him something of the greatness and charm of St. Paul.

With the great mass of the nation's youth in arms the chaplain's work is of vital importance for the future of our country, and there is no doubt that in many cases it is being done with much faithfulness and efficiency. Here is 'a book of Royal Air Force sermons' entitled *These Greatest Things*, by the Rev. Leslie S. R. Badham, M.A., Chaplain R.A.F.V.R. (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The sermons, fifteen in all, are brief, direct, and interesting. They deal with such topics as the Greatest Treasures, the Greatest Library of all Time, the Greatest Sources of Happiness, the Greatest Act in Human History, etc. Perhaps they might have been strengthened by a little more of definite Christian teaching, but the root of the matter is in them. The preacher has a knack of finding apt illustrations and his speech has a ring of sincerity which does much to commend his message.

Mrs. Stuart Moore, better known as Evelyn Underhill, could not have left a more beautiful memorial of herself than the addresses on *The Fruits of the Spirit* which are contained in the little book, issued by her husband (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). The thing that always strikes one with a feeling of pleasure in Evelyn Underhill's literary work is the combination of a profoundly spiritual atmosphere with a completely sane and human habit of mind, expressing itself not seldom in a kind of impish humour. Both these qualities are present abundantly in this lovely little work. It arose out of a request by twelve young women who were studying theology and desired some instruction on the devotional side. Mrs. Moore gave them the counsel they sought and, as the war separated them for special services, she followed up the addresses by regular letters. The whole book is a precious possession, and may well appeal to others than the original twelve disciples who desire similar spiritual help.

It is a great tribute to the enduring excellence of Cruden's work that for over two hundred years his Concordance has been in use wherever the Christian Bible is read and that reprints and new editions have continued to be published. The most recent of these is 'a new and revised edition' of the 'completely revised edition first published in 1930.' Its title is *Cruden's Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments*, edited by C. H. Irwin, M.A., D.D., A. D. Adams, M.A., and S. A. Waters (Lutterworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). Of course for the serious student Cruden is superseded by Strong's 'Exhaustive Concordance,' not only because it contains over a hundred thousand more references but because it links the English words to their originals in Greek and Hebrew. But for the general reader who wishes to verify a text Strong is too cumbrous, and Cruden is the thing. It cannot be said that this new edition is completely revised. We note that no references are given to 'Adummim' and to 'hazarded,' while under the heading 'stretch' the reference to Ps 143^{6} is omitted, and under 'sea' we look in vain for the beautiful text in Jer 49^{23}. Also under 'flood,' by a curious misprint which has persisted through previous editions, we read 'either side' for 'other side' (Jos $24^{2.\ 3.\ 14.\ 15}$). These, however, may be looked on as motes in the sun. We heartily welcome this new edition and hope it may prolong still further Cruden's already long and honourable life.

Two books on the vital subject of marriage deal with it in very different ways. *Those Vital Years*, by Mr. Hubert C. Libbey (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), is what may be called a religious treatment of the matter. The people aimed at are more or less devout people and this little book will help them by its friendly guidance. It is described as 'frank and friendly talks to those about to be married.' But it is not nearly so 'frank' as Dr. Herbert Gray's *Successful Marriage* (Rich & Cowan; 5s. net), which treats the realities

of married life, physical and moral and social, alike. Dr. Gray deals with choosing, love-making, rivalry, nagging, difficulties made by relations, 'keeping on her job,' infidelity, and contraception. He is quite decidedly in favour of contraceptives on certain conditions, and for the rest his counsel is marked by courage and common sense. *Successful Marriage* would furnish much needed help and guidance to those who contemplate matrimony if only it could reach the hands of the people who need it most.

The first three numbers of a new series of pamphlets on parts of the world little known here are issued under the general title 'War-Time Survey.' They are *A Racial Melting Pot: Religion in Malaya, A Christian Archipelago: Religion in the Philippines,* and *To-day in Thailand (Siam).* They are all written by Mr. Alexander McLeish, and are published by the World Dominion Press at 9d. each. It will be sufficient to draw attention to them here to secure a good number of readers. The titles are an indication of the attractive contents. We should all like to know something of these places, their people and their faiths. And here is a chance at little cost.

Reconstruction Problems.

VIII. Guild Organization of Industry.

By Maurice B. Reckitt, Guildford.

'Back to the Guilds?' was the heading of an article which recently (7th March 1942) appeared in *The Times,* and it was soon made evident to the reader that the question was asked in a spirit of apprehension rather than of hope.

Yet it would be altogether unhistorical, and reminiscent of the fallacies of *laissez-faire,* surrender to which has brought us, as many now declare, after a century of social conflict, to 'the end of economic man,' to regard the guilds as nothing but conspiracies in restraint alike of trade and of freedom, and as only dreadful warnings of what to avoid. How much more hopefully might the nation confront the problem of production in wartime if in every industry there existed a responsible authority, laying down standards for the industry, expressing its corporate will, and evoking the positive co-operation of its members at every stage of the productive process. As it is, we see our government, in default of any such 'functional' authority, forced on the one hand to erect a number of 'controllers,' chosen often from men more notable for their financial than for their strictly industrial qualifications, and on the other, to erect a pyramid of bureaucratic committees in an effort to extract an 'efficiency' which the normal organization of industry does little to guarantee.

It is just thirty years ago since the 'guildization' of our great industries was first seriously proposed. That lessons were to be learnt from the spirit and workmanship of mediæval industry had, of course, been urged before this by such social prophets as Ruskin, William Morris, and Arthur Penty, and the last-named had actually published in 1906 a small book entitled *The Restoration of the Guild System.* But these writers had made very little effort to relate their ideas to the situation and technique of contemporary industry; indeed they were all of them more or less explicitly enemies of industrialism. After 1910, however, a new situation emerged, when the syndicalist movement arose in many parts of the Continent to challenge the supremacy of State collectivism over the minds of the workers. This movement had a much greater significance than its economic crudities and revolutionary gestures might have appeared to indicate. It was indeed part of a general tide of feeling and thinking which came to be known as political pluralism; it arose to challenge the purely monist view of the State characteristic alike of Bismarck's 'prussianism' and Marx's socialism. One of the most able exponents of the challenge to what is known to political philosophers as the Austinian doctrine of sovereignty was Dr. J. N. Figgis, who published his *Churches in the Modern State* in 1913. In this he wrote:

> 'The State did not create the family, nor did it create the Churches; nor even in any real sense can it be said to have created the club or the trades union; nor in the Middle Ages the guild or the religious order; they have all arisen out of the natural associative instincts of mankind, and should all be treated by the supreme authority as having a life original and guaranteed.' [1]

But this is not what contemporary political tendencies, even in pre-totalitarian days, were disposed to allow, and the socialists the least of all. As a left-wing critic complained at this period: 'The Socialist spoke of brotherhood, while he threatened the very fraternities in which it could alone be found.'

[1] P. 47.

But syndicalism was a mood and a protest rather than an ordered social philosophy. Its theories toppled over towards anarchism, its gestures threatened social chaos. The question was whether what was true in it could be related to the actualities of the English tradition and the English scene. The answer was given in the office of a weekly journal, called, not inappropriately, *The New Age*, and conducted by the ablest editor of his time. In 1912 A. R. Orage and his colleague S. G. Hobson launched an attack upon the 'permanent hypothesis' of large-scale capitalism, the wage system—the assumption that human agents could and should be treated as a purely passive factor in a social process. They proposed in its stead that all grades in industry should enjoy a status of partnership in autonomous corporations, chartered by the State to function as national guilds. What began in an obscure office off Chancery Lane flowed out through the length and breadth of England. For half a dozen years 'Guild Socialism' was the livest option in the social thought and industrial effort of this country.

Its origin as a policy for the emancipation of labour primarily and predominantly went far to determine the forms which the idea took, and to impose some crippling limitations upon it. It might well have arisen from some different source and had for its first object some other goal of social amelioration. It might have come from the professional or technical ranks of industry, impatient of their subordination to financial considerations. In this case the vocational note might have been more definitely sounded than was in fact the case, and the essential social struggle seen as the late Will Dyson, that so individual and versatile cartoonist, liked to pose it as between Artist Man and Business Man.[1] It might have come from enlightened industrial leaders, apprehensive of bureaucratic control, yet ready to acknowledge the primacy of the public interest and to accept conditions establishing this in return for the chartered autonomy they would claim for industry. It might even have come from the State itself, as something of the sort did in fact come in Fascist Italy, with the deplorable result (which is not, however, inevitable in the nature of such a case) that the resulting 'corporation' was organized as the subservient tool of State policy, and that policy too often one of an aggressive and 'militarist' character.

In fact, however, the guild movement sought to graft itself upon the workers' movement and formulate for that movement new and more positive ideals. 'National Guilds,' says the protagonist from whom I have already quoted, 'give the worker something to work for, whereas the Collectivist only offered him some one to vote for.' The antithesis was too sharply defined to be altogether accurate, but there was a real truth in it and a salutary one. Yet the strategy of the guild socialists had about it a certain naïveté and unreality which to a large extent doomed it to failure from the start. It sought to thrust upon the trade unions, organizations developed for purely defensive purposes within the wage system, an aggressive ideology calculated not merely to disintegrate that system, but to build off its own bat (if such a mixed metaphor may be tolerated !) the positive organs of a new society in which many other social strata would have to co-operate if those organs were to survive and succeed. A degree of initiative was demanded from what was, even *ex hypothesi*, the most passive part of the population ('wage slaves' as the guild propagandists were wont to call them) such as must have been quite beyond the power of any such class to generate, and still more to maintain.

In fact, the workers in their trade unions did not at first pay much attention to the propaganda so energetically undertaken in their name. But the situation began to change when the circumstances attending the production of munitions brought into being the workshop committee and the shop steward speaking in its name. Here at the level of actual production problems attending the manning of machines and the systems of payment by results tended to raise the whole question of 'control,' at any rate amongst the more active elements in the working class. 'Guild' ideas began to make contact with matters within the sphere of the workers' experience, and might have made more headway still if the shop stewards' movement had not been diverted, under the impact of the Russian Revolution, from its true field into the barren wastes of revolutionary politics. But for the workers as a whole the guild idea only began to mean something with its translation into terms of a practical experiment. In 1920 came the Building Guild movement in which groups of trade unionists, fortified as a rule by municipal credit, set out to meet the post-war demand for new housing. The movement generated a great deal of enthusiasm among workers who liked to feel that they were banded together to work for the community in their own way, without the interposition of the capitalist, on a 'service not profit' basis. The experiments were successful from the technical point of view, and efforts to imitate them, though not on any large scale, were initiated in half a dozen other industries. But the guilds soon presented problems on the business side to which their managers did not prove equal, and with the coming of the slump after 1920, their power to survive at all was steadily undermined.

[1] See his book, *An Artist among the Bankers*.

But the slump destroyed much more than these few experiments in 'workers' control'; it destroyed the whole bargaining power of the working class on which so many optimistic labour assumptions had been based. Labour, in fact, lost the initiative, and many of its most enthusiastic champions became convinced that only a 'proletarian revolution' could recover it. Other guildsmen drew a different moral, and chief among them the pioneer of the idea, A. R. Orage. Already, indeed, in 1919, he had been arguing that the dominating force in industry was not 'capital' but finance, and that a prerequisite of any control of industry was the control of credit.

So perished the 'Guild Idea.' Yet the questions it had raised did not cease to be fundamental questions because the answers to them had been too narrowly envisaged and a national issue restricted to the fallacious categories of the 'class war.' What were those issues? They are not easy to summarize, but three most clearly emerge. First, a challenge in terms of social sovereignty. The guildsmen, as I have said, were 'pluralists.' The more intelligent of them saw, as many wise political thinkers have seen, that social liberty depends upon a tension between communal authorities and a distribution if not precisely of sovereignty, yet certainly of public power. Their bogey was the bureaucratic state. Yet a still more formidable monster was, in fact, just over the horizon. The advent of totalitarianism is surely sufficient in itself to establish the relevance of the guild idea. This lesson has been unhappily somewhat obscured by the spurious 'corporatism' of the Fascist state, but it is only superficial minds which can fail to perceive the distinction between a state-created and state-dominated corporation and an autochthonous and responsible guild.

The second issue was that of the social status of an industry. Is there no alternative between a 'free for all' scramble on the one hand or a monopolistic conspiracy to seize economic power on the other? If there is, must it take the form of a state-administered 'service'? Or have the great 'vocations,' with their professional standards of conduct, no lessons to offer which industry, it may well be, could even improve upon? A new relevance and a new urgency have been given to this question by the 'concentration' actually imposed upon many of our great industries by the government under the exigencies of war. This is a process which cannot be altogether reversed with the return of peace, and in any case probably ought not to be. The question is how to make such a development compatible alike with personal initiative and the public interest. The problem is complex and formidable no doubt, but surely a vital clue to it is supplied by the guild idea. May I be permitted to quote some words already written on this subject elsewhere?

> 'We think it would be better if the "concentration of industry" which war-time necessitates were not assumed to be a temporary measure which must be as far as possible undone at the earliest possible moment, but were rather embraced as providing the nation with an opportunity for refounding its industrial life upon guild principles. The negotiations by which "concentration" is to be effected are to be carried on between the Board of Trade and "representatives of employers and workers in the industries concerned." Here are all the elements of a national partnership which might introduce the functional principle into our industrial life and mark a stage towards its attainment of a professional status. . . . It ought not on any account to be assumed that the process of integration, now forced on industry by more indeed than the pressure of war, must inevitably take a monopolist form dangerous to the public interest, or have a stereotyping effect hostile to initiative within the industry. On the contrary, in the balance between a State exercising through credit and price control a regulative influence over economic conditions and such incipient corporations, increasingly democratic internally, enjoying industrial self-government, we see the possibility of avoiding the dangers of that bureaucracy so beloved of many of our "planners" on the one hand, and on the other, the means of creating conditions in which competition would be re-established as a blessing instead of the curse which plutocracy has too often made it. . . .
>
> By such a development we can make available for future generations that spirit of pride in public service and acceptance of specific obligation which is the true heritage for to-day of our aristocratic traditions.'[1]

The third issue raised by the guild idea is that of the status of the worker. It is highly significant that the proposal for National Guilds should have been based upon a scrutiny and a repudiation of the wage system. Even the conventional use of language reveals that the worker, hired as a 'hand,' is regarded as something less than a man. No doubt the guild propagandists of twenty and thirty years ago tended to make something of a fetish of 'industrial democracy' as a presumed cure for this sub-human status. More is involved in social enfranchisement than a vote for the foreman, nor is the multiplication of workshop committees a solely sufficient condition of industrial efficiency. But the guilds we may envisage will be false alike to their tradition and their name if they do not find means to enable the workers at the base of production to bring their personal impact to bear upon the control of their everyday work. That need is not to be satisfied by the appointment of a few trade union leaders to official committees. Industry must be so re-ordered that

[1] Maurice B. Reckitt and J. V. Langmead Casserley, *The Vocation of England*, 106–109.

even the person taking the humblest part in it can feel that he has his own fair share in 'helping to run the show.'

The development of the war has provided not only a need but an opportunity for evolving a new outlook in this regard amongst the workers. Many of the shop stewards in the engineering industry, and corresponding officials in other trades, are extreme left-wingers, and often members of the Communist Party. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that their main effort down to midsummer of last year was directed to putting a brake upon production and seeing that the 'exploited' workers got as much reward for as small an expenditure of energy as possible. It is no use our wasting indignation over this. If a country desires its organized workers to manifest an outlook of disinterested statesmanship it must exert itself, as we have not, to find for those workers a status of partnership in the nation's economic life from which such an outlook could spontaneously grow. But for the moment this stimulus has been provided from outside—by the Russian alliance. The left-wing shop stewards have been confronted with the delicate and difficult job of inducing those whom they had been accustomed to urge to take as little interest as possible in their work to take henceforward as much as possible. A situation is provided out of which, if successfully handled, a positive attitude to production might grow. Writing in the Communist *Labour Monthly* for last September, Councillor Jack Owen, speaking of the vital need for all workers to accelerate production, wrote:

> 'we should welcome this, for I believe this new attitude is in line with the training necessary for the workers to "take over" ultimately. We of the militant section have been put on our mettle in a way not possible before . . . The central idea is to suggest improved methods of production by co-operation, for tremendous results can thus be quickly obtained. The slogan should be: "The workers are going to give *and take* a hand".'

Even those who do not believe either in the possibility or the social necessity of the 'workers' in the proletarian sense 'taking over ultimately' can welcome not only the justice but the communal value of the claim that they should 'give *and take* a hand.'

If the guild organization of industry is to be anything more than a dream on the one hand or a menace on the other, the co-operation of thought and service from many elements in the community must converge to make this the goal of industrial effort. It cannot succeed if it is envisaged primarily as a device for the realization of class interest, corporate selfishness, or governmental convenience. And there is one more caveat which needs to be issued in regard to it. The evils which trouble industry do not arise exclusively or even predominantly from within industry. They result from a distortion of its purposes which is to a large extent imposed upon it by finance. This is a subject I have discussed elsewhere [1] and I can say no more about it now. But it would be a fatal error to suppose that any re-organization of industry which leaves the hypotheses of allegedly 'sound finance' unchallenged can possibly succeed. Problems of credit issue, problems of the 'just price,' even, as I believe, the achievement of a new basis for the income of the citizen, side by side with wages, in the principle of a social dividend, are in essence anterior to any problem of industrial reconstruction, and are primary factors in the determination of its successful solution.

I have dealt with this proposal on its merits as a secular proposition to-day. But I cannot conclude without recalling that the guild system was an integral feature of the social structure of mediæval Christendom. The old guilds, into whatever corruptions they may have fallen, represented a practical embodiment of values derived from a Christian doctrine of man and society. Their emergence at such a period was no accident, and their destruction was in effect part and parcel of the victory of economic secularism. A reviving Christian sociology will see in national guilds essential organs of a realm restored to Christian order.

[1] *Faith and Society*, chs. 9 and 10; *Religion in Social Action*, ch. 3.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque.

Prejudices.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?'—Jn 1[46] (R.V.).

You know, of course, who said that? It was Nathanael of Cana. But to get the full flavour of this foolish question you must realize that this was not a cultured gentleman of Jerusalem looking down his nose in contempt at a little country place, but a man of one little village sneering at another little village—Nathanael of Cana sneering at Nazareth, and waving Jesus aside as not worthy of consideration because He came from Nazareth! Only four miles divided Cana from Nazareth; an hour's walk could cover that, but it was not so

easy to bridge the gulf of prejudice between the two places.

It is very strange how local prejudices spring up and persist in the face of facts. A label is tagged on to a place, and everybody coming from that place has that label tagged on to him; and most can't see past the label to the man. So Edinburgh says Glasgow folk have money and no manners, and Glasgow folk say Edinburgh people have manners and nothing else; and everybody thinks Aberdonians are mean. *And not one of these things is true!*

In ancient Greece the Athenians said that the people of Bœotia were stupid and slow-witted, and so the word 'Bœotian' has come to mean 'blockhead.' Yet Bœotia produced one of the greatest poets of Greece, one of the greatest historians of Greece, and one of the greatest generals of Greece! Matthew Arnold used the word 'Philistine' to denote dull and uncultured people—why, no one can imagine—and we so use it; and yet the Philistines were clever and capable, and the Holy Land still bears their name, for 'Palestine' is just 'Philestine.'

It isn't frontiers that divide nations; it is prejudices. It is not lines on a map, but lines in the mind. It is easy to settle a frontier, but it is very nearly impossible to unsettle a prejudice. What is a 'prejudice'? It means 'judging beforehand,' making up your mind about something, or somebody, before you know all the facts about them, and then shutting your eyes to the facts when they are before you. It is very unreasonable, very foolish, and most often completely wrong.

The Jews had a saying, 'out of Galilee cometh no prophet.' But some of the greatest prophets of the Old Testament came out of Galilee; and the greatest of all prophets came, in New Testament days, out of Galilee; in Galilee He found His disciples; to Galileans He entrusted the work of His gospel; it was not a Galilean that betrayed Him; and it was Jerusalem, and not Galilee, that crucified Him.

We are all a little touched with this. We all repeat silly stories that keep such prejudices alive. Nathanael isn't the only man who has been blinded to a great chance by a little prejudice. The Samaritans drove Christ from their doors because He was going to Jerusalem, and they didn't like Jews; and they are not the only people who have done that.

One great lesson Jesus teaches us is to get above prejudice: not to form our opinions about anyone from gossip, not to accept blindly other people's verdicts, and so come with a ready-made judgment and a closed and prejudiced mind, but to wait and come with an open mind and try to see for ourselves what folk really are.

Jesus came into a world that was stiff with hoary and venerable prejudices. He just ignored them. He was brought up among them. He refused to be bound by them. He knew what people said about Pharisees. He saw bad Pharisees, but still He looked for good ones; and found them, such as Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea. The respectable and religious lumped 'publicans and sinners' in one sweeping condemnation. Jesus looked past the label and found among them the stuff of saints, and one of these finds gave us the First Gospel. The Jews hated Greeks and Romans; Jesus hated no one, and He found faith in a Roman centurion, and the promise of His kingdom in a group of Greeks. He ignored labels and class nicknames. Some Samaritans slammed their doors in His face and the disciples wanted Jesus to destroy them with fire from Heaven. Jesus rebuked the disciples and gave the world the parable of the 'Good Samaritan.'

And the way of Jesus was justified. The despised tax-gatherer, Zacchæus, was changed; Mary Magdalene, and the Samaritan woman at the well, and Matthew, and the Roman centurion, and Samaritans, received the gospel, and Galileans spread it. The disciples were surprised to find Jesus talking to a woman, but women stood by His cross when the men had fled, and women were the first to see the risen Christ and to bring the news of His resurrection.

Life is on the side of Jesus, and has given us wonderful gifts from despised and unlikely places and persons. Shakespeare came from the home of an English yeoman, Bunyan from a tinker's shed, Burns from a ploughman's cottage, Mary Slessor from a Dundee slum, and Livingstone from a Blantyre mill.

The great cities despise the little villages but they draw their life from them. The great nations despise little nations. A German professor has said 'there is something essentially ridiculous in the idea of a little nation.' Is there? Think what the world owes to little Greece, little Holland, little Scotland, little England, and little Palestine!

We must get the mind of Christ in this matter. Class hatred thrives on contemptuous labels: 'capitalists,' 'workers,' 'consumers,' 'producers.' They forget that they are all 'men,' and conferences fail to find peace because each side can't believe any good thing can come out of the opposite Nazareth.

National hatreds thrive on labels: 'Dago,' 'Yid,' 'Bosch,' 'foreigner.' We have to learn from Christ how to get beyond all that, to hack our way out of the jungle, and to see men as men, much like ourselves, with the same need for human friendship, and the same need for the salvation of God.

It is an uncomfortable thought that we may have ourselves been blind to Christ because He spoke in the accent of some despised Nazareth and we didn't believe any good thing could come out of Nazareth.

We must, I say, get the mind of Christ. When the nations do, and not until they do, will we be on the road to peace on earth, for that good thing can only come with Christ, who Himself came out of Nazareth.

Forestalling Temptation.

By the Reverend John Wilding, B.A., King's Norton, Birmingham.

'God will with the temptation make also the way of escape.'—1 Co 10^{13} (R.V.).

It really had been a most wonderful birthday. Early in the morning there were the presents from Father and Mother. Then the postman brought several fat and exciting parcels. And during the day friends called and they brought presents too. There had been toys to play with, books to look at, and such good things to eat. Towards evening the little chap gathered up all his sweets and his chocolate into one box. He tottered over towards his Mother and in a stern voice he said, 'Will you please put this up somewhere, *where I can't reach it*?'

It was as sensible as it was funny. The lad knew from past experience that so long as he and the chocolate were together there was a grave risk. Well, you know what the risk was and so there is no need to dwell on it! The chocolate was a danger, a temptation, to him, so he had it moved out of his way and busied himself with other things.

You may remember, if you have been learning first-aid at school, that one of the things we have to do at once if there has been an accident is to remove the patient from the danger or the danger from the patient. Our hero did the latter, or at least he enlisted his Mother's help to do the latter, to remove the danger away from himself.

I said it was a sensible thing he did. It was a most sensible way of dealing with a temptation. So often, without thinking, we hang about in places and in company where we are tempted to say and do wrong and foolish things. How much wiser would it be not to wait until danger comes, or where danger comes, but to put such things out of our way or to keep ourselves out of their way altogether. Swearing, gambling, cheating, drinking, all of these and other 'evil things' you will come across as you grow up. Now there is not often any need to linger where such things are all the fashion or with the people who like that kind of thing. If we do, there is a constant risk that we shall begin to drift into such habits too. It is far better to take the way of escape if it is at all possible and to keep out of the reach of such things. And where it is quite impossible to do that we can make a promise to God which will be like a shield between us and them.

One word of warning. It is not enough merely to keep ourselves away from temptation. If we keep out of bad company we must keep in good company. If we would escape bad habits we must form and keep good ones. If we are to avoid places of danger we must be happy and at home in places where we are strengthened for good.

You are in the family of the Church now. Will you all be still within it in twenty years' time? If you are wise and want to make the most of your life and of yourself, I think you will. Here you will find the guidance and the friendly help of other Christian people: here you will be kept constantly in touch with God, who will help you to pass temptations by unharmed, and who, when you cannot escape in that way, will help you to meet and defeat them in His Name.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday after Trinity.

Worldliness.

'And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.'—1 Jn 2^2.

The Christian message is a message of world-redemption. This persuasion has been the inspiration century after century of those strangely-moved men and women who have never been able to settle comfortably, or to live safe lives, within the frontiers of contemporary Christendom; of St. Paul and his spiritual successors; of Columba pitting himself against our uncouth forbears; of Donald Fraser daring to cry out in his youth, 'The world for Christ in this generation,' and in his manhood winning a whole province of Africa for Christ; of Mary Slessor and Schweitzer and Grenfell and their kin, men and women who could not be at ease within Christendom because they knew that the world belongs to Christ.

This persuasion must be the inspiration also of those whose call and task keep them within what is called Christian civilization. It may be useful and necessary for some purposes to think of the world in its geographical extension, and to colour the map according as this or that region is commonly called, or ventures to call itself, Christian, but we all know very well that this does not mean very much. It is more true to reality, and therefore a more pertinent challenge to missionary Christianity, to remember continually that the world is a single whole, one interlocked system of thought and life; that one and the same spirit of worldliness may pervade the whole system and express itself in all the habits and institutions of men; and that it is this spirit of worldliness which Christ came to subdue and transform.

Every human society, whether found within or without the so-called Christian frontiers, presents four characteristic features or focal points which may be described as Valley, Villa, Academy, and Temple.

By *the Valley* we mean the unmistakably shadowed aspect of human life, the realm of men's public and patent defeat as spiritual beings. It is always easy to point to conspicuous examples, apocalypses, offensive swamps and mud-flats which declare themselves for what they are; and it is always tempting to point as far away from home as possible. It is easy to be eloquent about slums, but are there no respectable dwellings where people are taking to liquor or obsessed by sex? The Valley runs wherever mists of passion obscure the stars, wherever flesh triumphs over spirit, and the native fire of the soul has

become choked and ashy; and Christ walks along the Valley and is able to lead men clear of its poisoned air.

The Villa is a different place from the Valley, and prides itself on the fact. In the Villa there flourishes a kindly domestic life, much solid good sense, often an admirable and fruitful public-spiritedness. But is not this to be charged against Villadom—and on Christian standards it is a very grave charge—that Villadom is apt to tolerate the world so long as the world will tolerate Villadom? Apt, far more deeply than it knows, and far more fervently than it believes in any ideal values, to trust in material securities for its own existence and preservation? Apt, therefore, to be correspondingly resentful and vindictive when these are threatened? It is perhaps only in the august presence of death that many a Villa dweller begins to face the thought that Christ came, not to redeem the Valley and adorn the Villa, but to save the world from worldliness and waken men to an inheritance of eternal life.

In *the Academy* men study problems and search for truth. In our own age this work has been crowned in one particular realm with an almost dazzling success—the realm of science pure and applied. But the dazzling nature of this triumph ought not to be allowed to obscure two facts. The first is that a dazzling Applied Science may very readily become a disastrous Misapplied Science. The second fact is this: apart altogether from the possibility of perversion in their application, the truths which the Academy formulates are largely departmental, truths within brackets as it were, outside of which brackets there stands a mark of interrogation. Now the more dazzling the material inside the brackets is, the greater becomes the danger that the brackets themselves will be obscured and the question-mark ignored. What is the chief end of man? What is the ultimate nature of this strange universe? Of course the Academy does explore these questions too, these ultimate questions the answers to which affect everything inside the brackets; it is the business of philosophy to do so. The philosopher puts his sign outside the extreme bracket—sometimes the plus of theism, sometimes the minus of the sceptic, sometimes the query of the agnostic, or it may be some cryptogram which it baffles the wit of any but the philosopher himself to decipher. 'Canst thou by searching find out God; canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is as high as heaven: what canst thou do? deeper than hell: what canst thou know? . . . For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt.' Can it be that the spirit of worldliness may insinuate itself into the Academy at its very highest point (to say nothing at all of its lower levels)—the point where it strives to be more faithful to truth; may insinuate itself through the wrong kind of human confidence which springs from a hidden root of *superbia*, and through the constant refusal on the part of the wise, adult mind at a certain limit of enquiry to become as a little child, and to receive as gift and revelation what may not be attained by human wisdom? Or can it be that Faber is right—

> Ah! God is other than we think;
> His ways are far above,
> Far beyond reason's height, and reached
> Only by childlike love?

In *the Temple* men affirm God, His goodness, His holiness, His mercy. That is the function of the Temple in society. It is sometimes performed carelessly and conventionally, and, so performed, does not disturb the world by a ripple. The man of the world is too serious in his own beliefs and pursuits to have time to spare for 'official' pronouncements.

Sometimes the function of the Temple is performed, one might almost say, callously. 'God's in his heaven—All's right with the world' sounds well in a lyric of springtime, for we take for granted the limits of the poet's realm of discourse; but it does not always sound well when it is quoted in the Temple. It can only sound well there when it is spoken in full view of sin and suffering, of cruelty and death. It has sometimes been said that the Book of Ecclesiastes ought never to have been included in the canon of Scripture. What a strangely facile judgment that is! Ecclesiastes is Scripture's protest against, and corrective to, any shallow or complacent religious faith. Are you so sure then, it asks? You who make these high claims and chant these swelling hymns, are your foundations so unshakably solid? Let Ecclesiastes remain and be read and pondered, for there is a piercing realism about Ecclesiastes which is not always the most noticeable thing about the Temple.

And yet it is possible to sing in the Temple as nowhere else 'God's in his heaven—All's right with the world.' It is possible for those who climb, as it were, to the pinnacle of the Temple and see a vision which can be seen from that vantage-point alone. It is the vision of the world as a unity to which Valley and Villa and Academy and Temple alike belong; the vision at the same time of a land very far off, shining with a solemn beauty which ravishes the heart with awe and with desire; the vision too of a gulf between the two worlds beyond the power of man to bridge and cross.

But from the roof of the Temple something else may be seen by those who have steadfastness and humility of heart to see it. It is the gulf being bridged and crossed from the other side; it is God Himself coming into the world and saying, 'I have surely seen the afflictions of my people . . . I know their sorrows . . . I am come down to deliver them'; God Himself coming in Christ into the depths of the human situation, suffering and dying—and rising again! Ah! Ecclesiastes is a very convincing book on every day except Easter Day.

To perceive these things is to know that the whole world has been redeemed, and to long that the whole world may know it; to receive these things by faith is to be forgiven and to hear the

Voice which says, 'Come now therefore, and I will send thee . . .'

Which saving knowledge and which missionary longing and call may God grant afresh to the Church in this day of the world's perplexity and need.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Confusion of Tongues.

BY THE REVEREND J. F. HUMPHREY, M.A., B.D., DARLINGTON.

'Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth.'—Gn 11[9].

The Semitic legend known to us as the story of the building of the Tower of Babel is apposite to us to-day. It is a story which seeks to explain why the races of mankind, having sprung from a common ancestry, speak so many different languages. The narrative in Gn 11 suggests that at the time to which this story refers mankind lived in one place and spoke one language. This race of primitive men, in the course of their wanderings, reached a place called Shinar in the land of Babylonia, and there they settled. They built a city there, and a lofty tower. This tower was to be a rallying-point for the people, and it was intended to prevent them from being dispersed abroad in the earth. But Jehovah came down from heaven to see the tower, and He disapproved of it. His jealousy was aroused. If this, He seemed to say, is the beginning of their ambition, what will be the end of it? So Jehovah confused the people's speech and scattered them abroad in the earth.

The story says that originally the human race was a unity. 'The whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.' The narrative is not accurate historically in that detail, for it can be demonstrated that there were other languages, such as the Babylonian and Egyptian languages, in vogue long before this time. But the suggestion that the human race was a unity at one time is helpful, because, beneath all the differences of race and colour and language that exist between men, there are certain things common to all men.

Physiologically the human race is one. The same biological processes produce life everywhere. We all, irrespective of race, must breathe, eat, drink, sleep. All our bodies are subject to invasion by disease, and at last we all must die.

Emotionally, the human race is a unity. Wheresoever man is, there is a creature capable of feeling love and hate, anger and forgiveness, joy and sorrow. Uncle Tom, in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, on leaving home to go as a slave to a distant plantation, felt the same anguish on being separated from his children as an Englishman, under the same circumstances, would feel to-day.

Mentally, the whole human race is very similar. The intellectual processes of men, whatever their nationality, are much the same. No nation can claim a monopoly of brains. Our library shelves are stocked with books, the authors of which are drawn from all the great races of the earth.

Spiritually the human race is of one language and of one speech. Anthropologists say that they have never found a race of men which had not some knowledge of prayer, and worship, and sacrifices to some superior being. Some of primitive man's religious ideas may have been very crude, but the idea was there, and it needed only purification and right direction. Wesley was an Englishman, Knox was a Scotsman, Luther was a German, Huss was a Bohemian. As St. Paul says, 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.'

Further, this narrative says, it was man's impious behaviour that led to the disruption of the human race. This lofty tower, with terrace upon terrace, and with an entrance to heaven as it was thought, was, according to Jehovah's judgment, a rebellion against Himself. The sin of these early men was therefore the sin of *superbia*, pride, which according to the old theologians was one of the seven deadly sins.

Milton asks, what caused our first parents . . . to fall from their Creator and transgress His will . . .? and he answers thus:

> The infernal Serpent; he it was . . .
> He trusted to have equalled the Most High,
> If he opposed, and, with ambitious aim
> Against the throne and monarchy of God,
> Raised impious war in Heaven. . . .

This is the root sin of man; man's claim to live independently of God; man's claim to put something in place of God; man's lust for power; man's craving for dominion. We so often, to our shame, seek our kingdom rather than God's kingdom. Nebuchadnezzar said, 'Is not this great Babylon, that I have built . . . by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?' Nebuchadnezzar had no desire to relate his work to God. At a later date, the Caesars set up Caesar-worship, and decreed that as many as would not worship them should be killed. Even to-day, the root cause of war, and poverty, and ruined lives, is this same fault in human nature. Sensuality, the wrong gratification of bodily impulse, is not the worst sin, though it is bad enough. Folly is not the root sin. But *superbia*, pride, man's attempt to build a tower with an entrance to heaven, that is the worst feature of the human heart.

This old-world story increases our indebtedness to it by implying that the broken human circle must be mended. The human race must reach unity before the world is saved. Geographically, the world is already almost a unity. Distance has been almost eliminated. Economically, the world is seeking unity. A trade dispute in Brazil affects Birmingham. The world is feverishly seeking unity. Politically, the world is trying to come together. We recall Mr. Churchill's dramatic offer to France—the offer of federation with the British Empire. It would seem most probable that, whatever may be the post-war solution of

[1] A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 13.

the problems of Europe, the British-speaking peoples will come closer and closer together.

The broken body of Christ is trying to knit together again. The Madras conference with its four hundred and seventy delegates, drawn from sixty-four different countries, is a striking example of this growing unity among Christians. There is One, as St. Paul so often reminds us, in whom Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, bond and free may become a unity, and that One is Jesus Christ.

Sometimes, when we think of this goal, and then look at the world in all its suspicion and strife, we almost despair. And then we recall the God whose face we dimly see in this story in Gn 11. At first, it seems a crude conception of God that is here presented. He is a God who comes down from heaven to earth; a God filled with jealousy at man's designs. But also, He is a God who can frustrate man's sinful plans, and check man's foolish purposes, and He can spread men abroad in the earth to the far-reaching good of man. There is the answer to any despondency we may feel to-day. The sovereignty of God, the overriding power and wisdom of God, in these facts we may find our hope.

> Deep in unfathomable mines
> Of never-failing skill
> He treasures up His bright designs,
> And works His sovereign will.

The power and wisdom of God, along with the healing unifying influences of Christ, will yet, we dare to think, lead mankind to a unity and peace of which this old-world story is the dim foreshadowing.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Rest of Revelation: A Communion Sermon.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN MACLEOD, M.A., D.D., ABERDEEN.

'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me . . . and ye shall find rest unto your souls.'—Mt 11[28f].

In this familiar and gracious passage we hear Jesus calling to Himself people for whom religion had become a burdensome thing. There were many such in His day. Ritual, tradition, law ended in the false peace of the Pharisee, or in the uncomforted despair of those whom a statutory religion convicted of poverty. Jesus saw before Him people who were being strained instead of being saved by their faith. But in Him they can find a faith active indeed yet rest giving. For to come to Jesus is to come to the knowledge of God the Father. 'No man knoweth the Son, save the Father; and no man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him.' The God who in Him lifts up His countenance upon men is not an added burden to their cares. He is the God in whom they can take the strain of life and live. In the company of Jesus the large world of the Father of our spirits is revealed and brought near, with its releasing ministries, its freely offered securities. What will heal the fret of faith and arm the power of faith is the joyful confidence that we have a merciful God, and that greater than what this God requires of man are those things He contrives, in His love, for men. 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' The gift of Jesus is the rest of revelation.

It is the rest of revelation. And this rest of revelation ranges far into the human condition. For us, as for those who first responded to the word of Jesus, this invitation also should be precious. Let us think of times and seasons in which the company of Jesus can confer this genuine giving, the faith which has rest in it.

(1) Consider first the concern in religion with self-knowledge. The personalism of religion intends to bring us into this region. In the awakening sense of God there is also a new seeing of ourselves. And as this seeing goes below the surface it can bring sharp reminders of our faults and failings. Our self-will and our ill-will are made manifest to us. It is needful indeed that we should know our spiritual whereabouts, and self-knowledge must be respected. Yet there is a burden in this knowledge. For it may be that as we turn this self-knowledge round and round in our hands it becomes a strained introspectiveness. We can so brood over the ill-furnished corners of our own being that, though we believe in God, what drives us is rather the frustration of a lost self-esteem. It is no rest, it is not safe for any man to take permanent lodgings in the poverty within him, yet many are inclined to do so. 'Come unto me,' says Jesus. This is the voice we do well to hear in all those hours when our finger is on our spiritual pulse, when we are scrutinizing our motives, and when self-reproach rebukes tentative confidences in the larger happier life. For it is to the God of captives Jesus brings men, and one of the captivities He can unloose is this captivity of self. He confers upon us the rest of revelation, for the world which Jesus discloses is the world of the Divine pardon. In that world new horizons rise upon our human discouragements. It is a world of power, and true religion is allowing things to happen to us out of that fair world of the Father of our spirits. For over against the burden of self is the bounty of God.

(2) There is, secondly, the burden of duty. We know that life is a call to service and to responsibility. What religion intends is to tether us all the more closely to our station and calling. A religion which was escapism would be no boon for man. But it is possible to experience fatigue in some of the fine regions of our being. As a prayer in an Anglican Order of Service puts it 'There are days when the road is out of sight, and our lives have no music in them.' Even our goodness can have a fierceness in it, a strained and hunted look about it. The hours come to every plodding diligent soul when its great need is not more knowledge of its duty but an increase, an enrichment of motiva-

tions for doing it. Faith without works is dead, but the works are often disfigured because faith is without rest. When Jesus calls men to Himself, when He says 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me' it was more than a call to offer Him fresh obedience. Rather it is His claim that in His company there are powers of refreshment for the duties of life. He can set up industries of restoration within our impulses and affections, so that doing becomes again worth while. This is a form in which He can ply the love of God in our human condition; it is rest to which any living in faith needs frequent return. There is a wear and tear in the imperatives of life which the moral philosopher often forgets, or at any rate for which the philosopher is not prepared to find healing. The high and holy powers for this reside in religion, yet not in every religion. It is the secret of Jesus. He has inspirations for our imperatives, attunes us yet again to the unconditional.

> We touch Him in life's throng and press
> And we are whole again.

(3) Finally, may we not affirm that the rest of revelation in its range speaks to us in the midst of the mystery of life? Both the scientific mind and the unreflective mind confess 'this mysterious universe.' No idea more persistently clings to some people than that the purpose of religion is to end mystery, to shed illumination far and wide upon the ongoings in time. And when this is not found to be so then there enters into our faith attitude a spirit of fretfulness; the hiddenness of things and the slow, precarious, inexplicable factors in existence as we receive it tease us; splinters of irritation lodge in our mind. When Jesus bids men come to Him, it is not an invitation to abandon thought. But our thinking is very much affected by the company, the society in which we allow it to take place. What begins to grow in us when we are near the mind of Jesus is the sense that while a flood-lighted world might seem profitable for us, it might ill suit the ends of God. There is rest in revelation because of these ends we are made sure. And the assurance of them is given to us by One who Himself was 'meek and lowly of heart.' For Him also the dark chapters were not all deciphered, for Him the mysteries of nature and life remained. Yet for Him the mystery that is the Love of God took the torment out of the other mysteries. To be able to understand 'everything' would perhaps be so arduous a privilege that we might not survive it. And, as that way out is blocked, there remains but one way for life, the way into the things of God the Father as Jesus helps us to know them. There we can do more than survive what the poet calls rather indiscriminately 'the weary weight of all this unintelligible world.' We can be set free from the intimidation of the darkness, and have release from the oppression of the undisclosed and the unresolved.

It is of the rest of revelation that the text is speaking. It is not the rest of nature, though doubtless nature would be more successful with us on her own level if we were more attentive to the voice of Jesus in His sphere. He comes with this gift of rest. When we take into our hands the bread and wine of Communion we confess it anew and take it; for the burden of sin, of duty, of thought is something all of us know. Nor can we ever forget, or rightly receive if we do forget, that this gift has come by a costly road. For it was at the Cross, 'where only death was kind to Him,' that Jesus consummated this genuine giving for you.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Who Commands the Morning?

BY THE REVEREND D. MYRDDIN DAVIES, B.A., B.D., CARDIFF.

'Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days?'—Job 38^{12}.

Sir Arthur Quiller Couch, speaking of the Book of Job, says, 'If you ask me for my opinion why Milton and Shelley dropped their intention to make poems on the Book of Job, it is that they no sooner tackled it than they found it to be a magnificent poem already, and a poem on which, with all their genius, they found themselves unable to improve.' He closes the lecture with the words of Lord Latymer: 'There is nothing comparable with it except the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus. It is eternal, illimitable . . . its scope is the relation between God and man.' This last sentence in fact explains its true significance. This poem, like all great works of art, owes its greatness to its theme: the writer set out to solve the difficult problem of the suffering of the innocent in a world ruled by a beneficent Deity. He does not succeed in solving the mystery, and whoever seeks in this book for an easy and satisfying solution of this most baffling of problems, is doomed to disappointment. But the inspired writer assuredly does succeed in doing something which is for us in these grim and dark days far more important. He reassures us, despite all appearances to the contrary, that the Almighty and Everlasting God is still Master of His universe, and Lord over His created beings.

In ch. 38 we arrive at the climax of the argument. Up to now Job has done all the interrogating. But now there comes a complete, though not abrupt, change over the whole scene. 'Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said . . . gird up now thy loins like a man; and answer thou me.' Then follows the magnificent series of questions among which are the words of our text, 'Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know his place?' To this sobering question, there is only one reply, 'The day is thine . . . thou hast prepared the light and the sun.' It is on this truth as on a firm rock that Job takes his final stand.

Thus to remember that God commands the morning should serve to comfort us and stabilise our spirits in facing whatever the dark and difficult future may have in store for us. In the first place, let the emphasis fall where it naturally should, on the grand fact that it is:

1. *God who Commands the Morning.*

Living as we do at the end of an epoch that has seen such amazing advancement in the realms of science, politics, and art, an epoch in which men had come to believe that the upward trend of things was as inevitable as the rising of the sun, we are not surprised that Swinburne's words:

> Glory to man in the highest,
> For man is the master of things,

came to be accepted almost as axiomatic. Since the beginning of the present century modern man comes upon the scene almost as an omnipotent being. 'Thou hast said in thine heart, I am, and none else beside me,' or, as Dr. Moffatt has it, 'I am supreme,' is an apt description not only of the typical Chaldean of Isaiah's day, but also of the humanist of the decade that immediately preceded the present war. Man had so vaunted himself as to believe that his power over Nature, himself, and his fellows was unlimited. Now that we have lived to see such a violent reaction against humanism, let us be on our guard against losing our sense of proportion. This assertion of man's independence did result in something very valuable, but the moment man's sense of moral independence overreached itself and arrived at the point of completely denying any religious dependence, when he confidently declared, 'I can do all things,' and omitted to add, 'Through Christ, who strengtheneth me,' then his spiritual development had become definitely lop-sided. We have discovered to our sorrow that the historical as well as the logical outcome of such arrogance culminates in the self-deification of man in the form of a dictator. If in the confident 1920's we had come to believe that there was no limit to man's power—power for good for the most part—now that night has fallen on our generation we are tempted to believe that there is no limit to man's power for evil.

It may have been some such agonising experience, though in a more personal and intimate way, that tempted the hero of the Book of Job to doubt if the reins of power had not been taken out of God's hands. To meet this most poignant of all perplexities, we have the long list of questions that begins with ch. 38: 'Where wast thou when the foundations of the earth were laid? And what man hath the measures thereof? Or who shut up the sea with doors, or made the cloud the garment thereof? Who caused the morning stars to sing together? The rain to fall on earth where no man is, and to cause the bud of the tender herb to spring forth?' Who commands the morning? To all these questions there is only one answer. Sage and saint, philosopher and little child all alike reply, God commands the morning. From Wordsworth's meanest flower that blows to a little maiden's 'Hitler can't stop the flowers growing, mammy,' we derive the same quiet assurance that there is a definite limit to the power of man.

Whoever has experienced the terrors of but one 'blitz' has had occasion to render thanks for the literal truth of our text, namely, that to hinder the coming of the dawn is outside the scope of any dictator's power. So, even as many of us who dwell in target areas were strengthened and succoured during many a grim night with the comforting prospect of the certainty of approaching dawn, thus during these dark and difficult days the very essence of morale is to know that God still commands the morning.

Let us try to get at the significance of this by approaching our text from another angle. Let us change the emphasis and place it on the word morning:

2. *It is the Morning that God Commands.*

We take the word morning here in its figurative sense as synonymous with light, just as night is synonymous with darkness.

Now the Bible is at one with the sacred literature of every nation in correlating light with goodness and darkness with evil, and in stressing the perpetual struggle between them. 'He overturneth them in the night so that they are destroyed.' This is the dark side of things. The opposite is contained in these words: 'Thou shalt shine forth; thou shalt be as the morning.' But this book contains one immortal verse which includes, in a sense, both these opposites. The Welsh version reads, 'Who giveth causes for singing in the night.' The chief cause for singing in our darkest night is the indubitable fact that it is the morning, in the sense of goodness, that God commands. It is our sin that brings evil and wicked things to pass. Like naughty children, from generation to generation, we wilfully blow out the lights, and so night must fall.

But despite our perversity, wilfulness, and sin, we cannot shut out God. Though night must fall as a result of human sin and folly, it is not God's last word to redeemed humanity. The writer of Genesis, right at the beginning of the divine revelation, with the inspiration of consecrated genius suggests that the correct order of God's redeeming love in creation, as in redemption, is that morning follows night. 'And the evening was, and the morning was.' Prophet and Psalmist alike agree in proclaiming that it is the morning that God commands. And so right down to the final revelation in the death and resurrection of our Lord. When there was darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour, even of that ghastly afternoon we are able to declare with the Fourth Evangelist: 'Amid the darkness the light shone, but the darkness did not master it. But where there was much sin, there—at that very spot—was much more grace.

And thus poor, frail, sinful humanity is able to declare with the great Apostle: 'For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.'

> New every morning is the love
> Our wakening and uprising prove;
> Through sleep and darkness safely brought,
> Restored to life, and power, and thought.

The Last Passover in the Gospels.

By Emeritus Professor Percy J. Heawood, Durham.

The events of the last Passover-week in the Gospels have always been of absorbing interest. But so many assumptions have gathered about the details of Passover observance, leading sometimes to unnecessary difficulties, that there still seems to be room for an unprejudiced examination of the facts.

A subsidiary point of some interest is concerned with the very general assumption that the Jewish day must be taken, in all connexions, as a period of twenty-four hours rigidly reckoned from sunset to sunset. There is very little trace of this in the O.T. As the article 'Day' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* happily puts it: '"From dawn to dark" was the ancient and ordinary meaning of a day (יום) among the Israelites; night, as being the time "when no man can work," might, it was considered, be left out of account altogether, or, at all events, as being the evident complement of the "day," and involved in it, did not require explicit mention. . . . The Israelites regarded the morning as the beginning of the day; in the evening the day "declined" or "went down," and until the new day broke it was necessary to "tarry all night."' And so we find the natural order 'day and night' not only in the O.T., as Lv 8^{35}, Nu 9^{21}, but also in the Mishna; *e.g.* in Ber 4^{1} the times of prayer are mentioned in the order Morning—Afternoon—Evening; though there are exceptions even in the O.T. In Hull 5^{5} we learn that Simeon b. Zoma based his view, that in Lv 22^{28} 'one day' means the daytime together with the preceding night, on the first chapter of Genesis; but in Ber 1^{1} it is laid down that when, as in Lv 7^{15}, offerings must be consumed the same day, the duty lasts until the rise of dawn, and that the Sages only said until midnight to keep a man far from transgression. As to Gn 1, renderings like the A.V. 'the evening and the morning were the first day' have suggested a day consisting of two periods, of which the first was evening; but if ערב (evening) might be stretched to include the gradual coming on of darkness, or possibly in Job 7^{4} night itself, בקר is certainly daybreak, not the period before the day declined. So after, at God's word, light had come, the sentence 'there was evening and there was daybreak one day' winds up the record of the first and marks the transition to the second 'day' of creation. So Augustine, *De Gen. Cont. Man.*, I. 16 [x], 'Tanquam finito die facta est vespera, sed quia etiam nox ad diem suum pertinet, non dicitur transisse dies unus nisi etiam nocte transacta cum factum est mane.' So throughout. Even the ludicrous fancy in Ab 5^{6} about ten creations on the evening of the sixth day 'between the suns' points in the same direction.

If, later, observances connected with the beginnings of months and the eve of the Sabbath encouraged the idea of a period extending from evening to evening,[1] the more natural way of regarding the day was not in abeyance. Note the phrase in Mt 28^{1} *τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*; so in Lk 23^{54} *σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν* the Sabbath was dawning.

All this, however, is subsidiary to the problem of Passover nomenclature, confused occasionally by the use now of more precise, now of more general language. In a general sense, the whole period of eight days from the 14th to the 21st Nisan inclusive might be called the Passover or the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Thus Josephus (*Ant.* ii. 15, 1 [317]) *ὅθεν . . . ἑορτὴν ἄγομεν ἐφ' ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ τὴν τῶν ἀζύμων λεγομένην*. But elsewhere he is more precise. After mentioning (*Ant.* iii. 10, 5) *τεσσαρακαιδεκάτῃ κατὰ σελήνην . . . . τὴν θυσίαν πάσχα λεγομένην* he continues *πέμπτῃ δὲ καὶ δεκάτῃ διαδέχεται τὴν πάσχα ἡ τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτὴ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας οὖσα*. Now this account of the Passover on the 14th Nisan *succeeded* on the 15th by the Feast of Unleavened Bread, agrees precisely with Lv $23^{5.\,6}$: 'In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, [between the two evenings] is the Lord's passover (פסח ליהוה). And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread (חג המצות) unto the Lord: seven days ye shall eat unleavened bread.' So Nu $28^{16.\,17}$. And the same distinction occurs in the accounts of the passovers kept by Hezekiah, 2 Ch $30^{15.\,21}$ (compare Josephus, *Ant.* ix. 13, 3 [271]), and by Josiah, 2 Ch 35^{17}; also in Ezr $6^{19.\,22}$.

Now the statements of the Synoptists are in strict accordance with this precise language. They say indeed that it was on the first day of unleavened bread that the disciples made ready the Passover; but that is all right: all the eight days were 'days of unleavened bread' (compare Ac 12^{3}); but they do not say 'of *the feast* of unleavened bread.' That is a mistranslation by the A.V., corrected by the Revisers, in Mt 26^{17}, though they wrongly leave 'the *feast* of the passover' in Mk 14^{1}; where

[1] That the fast of the Day of Atonement extended from evening to evening (Lv 23^{32}) has not much bearing on the period of a normal day.

it should be 'the passover,' as corrected by them in Mt 26^{2}. Lk 22^{7}, 'the day of unleavened bread came, on which the passover must be killed' is all right, and we need hardly quarrel with the vaguer introduction in *v.*[1]. But further confusion is introduced by the A.V. translation 'not on the feast day' (μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ) Mt 26^{5}, Mk 14^{2}, often wrongly understood of the day of the Passover, but corrected by the R.V., to 'not during the feast.' Cleared of mistranslations, we have the Passover on the 14th, the first day of unleavened bread.[1] Then the Feast of Unleavened Bread would begin on the 15th, and last seven days, the first and seventh being special days each marked by a Holy Convocation (מקרא קודש) or perhaps Holy Proclamation, Lv $23^{2.4}$, etc., in the language of the Pentateuch (paraphrased by 'dies celeberrimus et sanctissimus,' with some variations, in the Vulgate), a Good Day (יום טוב) in that of the Mishna; an expression which occurs rarely and less technically in the O.T.

But the Passover in the strict sense (פסח) was indissolubly connected with the celebrations of the evening and night which followed the 14th, not exactly a festival but 'a night of watchings' or 'of observances, unto the Lord' (ליל שמרים) Ex 12^{42}, and the Rabbis saw in the bitter herbs a reference to the bitterness of Egyptian slavery (Pes 10^{5}). It could be eaten only on that night, and only until midnight (Zeb 5^{8}), though they were allowed till daybreak to burn the remnants with fire (Ex 12^{10}); so in Ber 1^{1} we find the duty of burning lasts 'until the rise of dawn' (עד שיעלה עמוד השחר). So the celebration ended; and practically at all events the Festival began with the dawn of a new day.

So far all is plain sailing; but when we turn to the Fourth Gospel we find striking differences. It is precisely stated in Jn 12^{1} that Jesus came to Bethany six days before the Passover, but the actual Paschal meal as such (supposing that to be included in the supper) is left in the background. Further, at the trial before Pilate, the Jews did not enter the Praetorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover (ἀλλὰ φάγωσιν τὸ πάσχα) Jn 18^{28}, as though that were yet to come. It would be strange if the precise language of the Synoptists should be prejudiced by a single sentence in the Fourth Gospel (which might indeed be a gloss). But, before deciding that either is wrong, it may be well to make a wider survey, and see how the term Passover *is* used both in a stricter and a more general sense. We have seen something of the sort in Josephus; but we find the most striking contrast in the O.T. itself, when we compare Ex 12 with Dt 16. In the impressive ritual of the former, the Paschal lamb is everything, and the eating of unleavened bread on the days that follow is a mere appendage, attributed in 12^{39} to the haste of departure, though prescribed in *v.*[15] for future generations. But in Dt 16^{1-8} little or no prominence is given to the special sacrifice of the Paschal lamb. 'Thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd (בקר) . . . seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread *therewith* (עליו)'; and though the ritual of 14th Nisan is recognized in *vv.*[4-6] 'Neither shall any of the flesh, which thou sacrificest the first day at even, remain all night until the morning,' that comes as an afterthought; it is *all* 'the Passover.' Though the Rabbis were exercised by the mention of the 'herd' in Dt 16^{2}, and in Men 7^{6} made a lame attempt to explain away the reference to the Passover, we find the double tendency in the Mishna itself. While פסח is applied in a very special way to the Paschal lamb and to the ritual of the 14th Nisan, there are instances of its use to include the whole festival period, as in Taan 1^{2}, where they are to pray for rain (according to R. Juda) עד שיעבור הפסח *i.e.* apparently, until the conclusion of whole festival; so Ac 12^{4}. And when the Rabbis faced the question of the difference between the Passover of Egypt and the Passover of later generations, they decided that while the getting of the lamb on the 10th of Nisan, the sprinkling of the blood on the lintel and the two side posts, the eating in haste, and during one night, were peculiar to the Passover of Egypt, the Passover of later generations *continued throughout seven days* (Pes 9^{5}). There is therefore ample authority both in scripture and tradition for extending the term Passover, on occasion, to include the days of the Feast. As to the restriction of the term 'Feast' to the days which *followed* the Passover proper, it is of interest to observe that the *central* idea of the חג, now often translated 'Pilgrim Feast' was the 'appearing' before the Lord with an offering, hence called ראיה in the Mishna (*e.g.* Ḥag 1^{2}). There would be no opportunity for this on the 14th of Nisan.[2]

But difficulties have been found in the move-

[1] Confusion as to days has been increased by the traditional translation of Pes 1^{1} as to the time for entering on the search for leaven, with which the treatise so abruptly begins. Literally this is 'the light of the fourteenth' (אור לארבעה עשר), which might naturally mean the beginning of daylight: the reference to a lamp and the fact that in 1^{3} אור precedes שחרית suggests an early hour; but to translate 'the night of the fourteenth, on some *lucus a non lucendo* principle, met with many protests, as we find in the Talmud, and need not much concern us, especially as search was allowed during several morning hours.

[2] In a modern Jewish calendar the days from 15th to 22nd Nisan (inclusive) are given as 1st to 8th of the Festival of the Passover; but then they have no Paschal Lamb.

ments of Jesus and the disciples after the supper, and in particular in the suggestion that when Judas went out into the night he might be going to buy things needed for the feast (Jn 13^{29}). But when they had fulfilled their Passover obligations were they not free to wander where they would, or even to make purchases? The provision (Dt 16^{7}) 'thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents' suggests considerable freedom of movement. There is a curious passage in Pes 10^{8}, ואין מפטירין אחר הפסח אפיקומן, traditionally supposed to forbid concluding the Passover meal with dessert; but, if the final word represents the Greek ἐπὶ κῶμον, the translation 'After the passover meal they should not disperse to join in revelry' (as Danby) is very plausible, and would not forbid more harmless ways of spending the time. Even on the first day of the Feast it was not all work, but only servile work (מלאכת עבודה) which was forbidden (Lv 23^{7}, Nu 28^{18}), and there was special exception made for 'that which every one must eat' (Ex 12^{16}). So Meg 1^{5} on the distinction between sabbath and festival: אין בין יום טוב לשבת אלא אוכל נפש בלבד. But indeed there may have been loopholes left for nocturnal purchases; and if, in that year, the 16th Nisan, the day usually assumed for the waving of the Omer (Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 10, 5 [249]), coincided with the weekly Sabbath, it would explain the note in Jn 19^{31} that 'the day of that Sabbath was a high day' (μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου), and perhaps justify more laxity even on the day of the feast.

While the Temple was still standing and some regulations were enforced with great rigour, the Rabbis were very clever in avoiding inconvenient contingences. The Mishna is not a very coherent body of doctrine or ritual, and it avowedly contains many contradictory judgments standing side by side; and there are various concessions to local customs, *e.g.* Meg 4^{1}, Pes 4^{5}. There is a very naïve admission in Ḥag 1^{8}: 'The rules about the Sabbath, Festal offerings, and sacrilege are as mountains hanging by a hair (כהררים התלויים בשערה), for [teaching of] Scripture [thereon] is scanty and the rules many.' They are contrasted with rules that have scriptural support (יש להן על מה שיסמוכו), and 'these are the substantial matters of the Law.'

Contributions and Comments.

κατέλαβεν in John i. 5.

Jn 1^{5} (ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν) is translated in the A.V. 'the darkness comprehended it not.' The R.V. text has 'apprehended it not'; the margin, with a reference to 12^{35} (Greek), renders 'overcame.' Most of the commentaries provide discussions of these alternative renderings. Dr. C. J. Ball suggested (Expository Times, XXI. 93) that we should 'suppose an original Aramaic term אקביל, *darkened*, which the Greek translator confused with the similar קביל, *took* or *received*,' and the suggestion is approved in Burney, *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 29 f., and Burney's note that in Syriac the root קבל occurs in the Aph'el strengthens the proposal. The question is whether any such proposal is necessary. Neither of the two possible meanings of κατέλαβεν is sufficiently difficult to necessitate emendation.

The right interpretation is probably given by Hoskyns (*Commentary, ad loc.*). He says: 'The double significance of the Greek verb—*to grasp with the mind* and so *to comprehend*, and *to grasp with the hand* and so *to overcome* or *destroy* (12^{35}; Mk 9^{18}; 1 Thess 5^{4})—must be given full weight in the interpretation. . . . The opposition of the Jews which effected the death of Jesus was rooted in their failure to apprehend Him or His teaching. The Light is, however, unquenchable.' We may support this exegesis in two ways.

(1) Play on the double meaning of words is a trick of style characteristic of the Fourth Evangelist. We may instance the use of ναός in 2^{19-21}, of ἄνωθεν in $3^{3.7}$, of ὑψοῦν in 3^{14} 8^{28} 12^{32} and of κοιμᾶσθαι in $11^{11.12}$.

(2) There are examples of such use of καταλαμβάνω. Lucian in his satire *Philosophies for Sale* (Βιῶν Πρᾶσις) brings in turn to the slave market representatives of the various philosophical schools. Last of all comes the Sceptic. After some conversation the buyer asks the philosopher what he can do. The Sceptic answers that he can do anything except catch a runaway slave (δραπέτην μεταδιώκειν). The buyer inquires, 'Why can you not do that?' And the reply is, 'Ὅτι, ὦγαθέ, οὐ καταλαμβάνω'—'I cannot overtake anything,' with allusion to the Sceptics' denial that anything could be apprehended. Lucian makes the same pun in his *True Story*, ii. 18. The Academics had not reached the Isle of the Blest because they 'did not arrive at anything' (μὴ καταλαμβάνοντας).

It seems probable that the Evangelist has anticipated Lucian's pun and means both that the darkness of the world could not understand the Light of God, and that it was unable to quench it. Incidentally, this interpretation augments the stylistic bonds which unite the Prologue to the main body of the Fourth Gospel.

C. K. Barrett,

Wesley House, Cambridge.

'Covenant' in the Old Testament.

It is generally recognized that the religion of Israel, even in its most elementary forms, differs from nearly all other faiths of antiquity in the fact that it is based on a Covenant. Not only is this true, but we find the term used by our Lord Himself, at the most solemn moment of His life, to indicate that ideal relationship between God and man which nothing but His blood could make eternally valid. Yet the term jars on many of us, and we cannot help wishing that some other phrase, metaphor, or mode of expression had been employed. For to us a 'covenant' savours of a business transaction; it is an agreement made between two parties, each of whom undertakes either to perform certain acts or to refrain from performing certain acts. As long as the promises are fulfilled, the 'covenant' stands, but if and when either party fails in its performance, the other is *ipso facto* released from all obligations. In other words, a 'covenant' is a bargain, often of the most sordid commercial type; we think of Jacob at Bethel.

This very incident, however, suggests that we may be reading into the Hebrew term *Berith* something which is not there. For the word is nowhere used in Gn 28^{10-22}; Jacob vows a vow—which is always a sort of bargain—but he makes no covenant. And when we look further into the matter it becomes clear that, while conditions might be accepted on one side or on both, they are by no means necessary to the validity of a covenant. It is true that we sometimes get the impression that the parties to the covenant accept mutual obligations. Abraham and Abimelech make a covenant (Gn $21^{27ff.}$), and we assume that they agree not to transgress one another's rights in water. But this is not explicitly stated, and we may have been misled by our own preconceptions of what a covenant involves. The covenant, however, made between Ahab and Ben-hadad (1 K 30^{34}) certainly seems to imply conditions accepted by both sides; Ahab undertakes to grant Ben-hadad life and liberty, and the Aramæan king agrees to give the Israelite trading facilities (probably implying some kind of subordination) in Damascus. But this is almost the only instance in which obligations are undertaken by both parties as conditions on which the covenant is made and on which it may stand.

On the other hand, there are many instances in which a promise is given on one side, without any express acceptance of duties on the other. Thus the people of Jabesh Gilead ask Nahash to make a covenant with them (1 S 11^{1}), the condition being that they shall become his slaves. Even when the two parties are God and man, in the individual cases all the obligations are on one side or the other. In Gn 15 Yahweh makes a covenant with Abram, but exacts no promise from him, while He does undertake to give Abram's descendants the whole land of Palestine. More often conditions are imposed on man, as when in Gn 17 Yahweh makes a covenant with Abraham, and imposes the rite of circumcision as its sign. Even this, perhaps, is hardly a condition in the full sense of the term, though its implication is that any uncircumcised male is necessarily outside the covenant relation, and must, therefore, be cut off lest he pollute the holy community. The outstanding example of a one-sided covenant, however, is that of Sinai (or Horeb) itself. The actual covenant is expressed in the phrase, not found here but frequent later, 'I will become your God and you shall become my people.' This, in itself, imposes no specific obligations on either party, though it does inaugurate a new and intimate relationship, but all accounts of the event and all references to it show that Israel had to accept certain duties and responsibilities, defined, according to Deuteronomy, by what was inscribed on the tables of stone (Dt $5^{2ff.}$). In the main narrative of the covenant ceremony on this occasion (Ex 24^{1-8}), the victims' blood is thrown over the altar, thus including Yahweh, but, before the people are similarly treated, the conditions they have to observe are read to them, and it is only after they have accepted these provisions that they too come under the all-embracing blood. Most cases of covenant-making in the Old Testament are of this type, and there is one curious instance in which both parties undertake obligations, not to one another, but to a third group which does not formally participate in the covenant. This is the covenant made between Zedekiah and all the people who were in Jerusalem to release their Hebrew slaves. They break their word, and punishment is threatened, but it is not because they have been false to one another but because they have broken a solemn promise to which Yahweh has been a witness, and there is certainly no suggestion of a two-sided agreement here. In fact it is very rarely that we find that acceptance of formal obligations by both sides which is essential to a commercial bargain.

It is even possible that a covenant may be made in which neither side makes any explicit promises. One illustration will suffice, that of the covenant between David and Jonathan. It is true that David later claims the kind of treatment which the relationship imposes (1 S 20^{8}), but the terms used imply that there is no specific condition or line of conduct laid down as between the two of them; David simply appeals to Jonathan to show '*hesed*,' the proper expression of love which any relationship will impose. It is clear that there was nothing of the nature of a bargain between these two.

This last illustration may help us to a better understanding of the ideas and feelings which actuated the ancient Israelite when he spoke of a 'covenant.' What David and Jonathan did was to enter into a kind of blood-brotherhood, a new relationship in which they might be regarded no longer as two separate entities but as one. When Jonathan gave his clothing and weapons to David, he was transferring to him his actual personality, so binding the two individuals into a single unit. It is this conception of a new

complex personality, formed by the combination of two or more separate individuals or groups of individuals, which constitutes the idea of the covenant for ancient Israel. This is implied in all the forms of covenant ceremony which have been handed down to us, especially in the two major rites which involved the use of the life-blood of a third party to serve as a common term between the other two. Unified with the victim, the two are now unified with one another; their personalities are no longer even merely contiguous, they are continuous, and the same vital essence runs through them both. It may be that this union is held to be valid only for certain purposes and within certain spheres, in which case the limits will be defined and the conditions accepted by one side or the other expressly stated, but such limitations and conditions are no part of the essential nature of the covenant itself. If we would understand the spiritual history of Israel, we must rid ourselves of all ideas connected with a commercial bargain. At the sacred mountain Yahweh became the God of Israel and Israel the people of Yahweh. Henceforward He was an actual member of the human group, though His position in it was far above that of any other. The union could be broken, it is true, for in this instance He had required the people to accept certain conditions. But it is noticeable that the final breach came only when Israel deliberately excluded Yahweh from their own community and adopted another deity in His place (Jer 44); they refused to regard Him as their God any longer.

Above all must we recognize the true nature of the Israelite covenant if we are to understand what Jesus said on the last night of His earthly life. The ideal relationship between man and God is the closest and most intimate union of God with man. This is made impossible by human sin, and no effort on man's side can avail to restore the broken unity or to make it eternally valid. That 'covenant,' that unification of God and man can be achieved, as in ancient Israel, only through the liberated vital essence of a third party, and He, the Christ of God, was the only one in all history whose life-blood would thus suffice.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

Entre Nous.

The Canadian School of Missions.

In *The International Review of Missions* for April a well-balanced but full and interesting account of certain distinctive qualities of the Canadian School of Missions has been written by its Director, Dr. J. Lovell Murray. One of these features is that, although the activities of the institution are so extensive as to demand the services of many people, *it is not a costly undertaking*. No fees are charged for tuition or any other privileges and no honorariums are paid to its lecturers. 'Every year many scores of persons are enlisted for some form of service, all on a voluntary basis.'

Another distinctive feature is that 'it is a union institution in the fullest sense. *It is vastly more than a co-operative effort.* It is a case of every one of all the Protestant churches of a nation saying, "Go to, let us form a partnership for the one purpose of providing specialized training for our missionaries and candidates," and then proceeding to put not only the necessary finances, but also their energies, skill and prayers, into a common fund. There has never been observed within the school a trace of denominational ambition or suspicion.'

A more surprising feature is the third feature—*the wide network of private tuition.* 'Some subjects are better taught individually. In others there is frequently only one missionary or candidate for whom the instruction seems to be needed. Naturally there is a broad and often amusing variety of subjects called for. Every year missionary doctors have wanted observation and refresher coaching in radiology, bone-and-joint surgery, or other medical lines. Nurses from the Arctic have needed instruction in simple dentistry or anæsthesia. An Indian missionary once asked for tuition in three subjects—educational psychology, motor mechanics, and the banjo; a nurse from West China desired house-building; the principal of a girls' school asked for taxidermy; many have wanted music in its various branches; not a few request coaching in arts and crafts; a Japan educator pled for instruction in cartooning; a South China missionary's need was for poultry-raising; a lady from South America simply had to have instruction in morgue technique! The choice of teachers for this one-by-one instruction is made as carefully as for lecture courses. And, so far as is known, no missionary who announced a need for individual training during a furlough year has gone back to the field with his desire unsatisfied. During the past year personal instruction was given in twenty-eight different subjects by over forty teachers. This does not take account of the helpful counsel given to candidates and young missionaries by the veterans, furloughed or retired, and by Mission Board secretaries.'

One of Us.

Written by an American for Americans the theme of Mr. Gerald W. Johnson's *Roosevelt* is the theory and practice of Mr. Roosevelt as

President of the United States. The problems dealt with are for the most part political problems. They are presented in a live way in this well-written book. As we read it we happened on a more personal paragraph—one which dealt with the dreaded infantile paralysis which struck Mr. Roosevelt down at the age of thirty-nine. 'Before the infection was checked both his legs were paralysed and his arms less seriously, but still badly, affected. It was by a chillingly narrow margin that his life was saved. . . . Based on the medical experience of the time it was not an unreasonable prediction, in 1921, that Roosevelt would spend the rest of his life as a helpless invalid, confined to a wheel-chair, if indeed, he could leave his bed. It would be pointless to review in detail the events of the next seven years. All that is essential in them can be summed up in very few words. Shortly after his illness began he said to his wife, "I'll beat this thing." The greater part of the following seven years he spent making those words good. . . . Physical competence was not all he acquired though, and not by any means the most important thing he acquired. It was this fight that made him one of us.

'Consider his whole life's experience up to this point. Certainly it was not much like the experience of the average American. His possession of money was part of the difference, but not an especially important part. His possession of a great name was part, and his possession of friends in high places a more important part; probably more important even than that was his usual capacity to please people at the first meeting, and the most important thing of all was his possession of an extraordinary mental equipment. But the vast difference, the thing that set him miles away from the average man and woman, was none of these nor the sum of them all. It was the fact that in all his thirty-nine years it is impossible to find a single important shadow.

'Any man of whom that may be said is a man apart from common humanity. . . .

'Between 1921 and 1928 Franklin D. Roosevelt drank, and drank deep. He had never known poverty before, but any sturdy beggar is richer than a man who does not possess command over his own legs. He had never known defeat, for the race against Gerard was a mere check, and the campaign of 1920 was in some sense a triumph; but now he knew it, for now he was beaten to the ground, beaten flat and left half dead. He had little personal acquaintance with injustice, but what could be more unjust than this assault of malignant fate? He had known not much of pain, but now he learned. He had been a rejoicing athlete, and now he was a cripple. His companions had been the fortunate of the earth, but now he was among the earth's disinherited. He had always been accustomed to deference, as a superior man, but now he knew the fathomless bitterness of being pitied.

'He came out of that fight scarred and maimed for ever, but, by that same token, he came back one of us.'

Sell What Thou Hast.

'Down at Warm Springs, in Georgia, he [F. D. Roosevelt] found a swimming pool that was wonderfully helpful. Some newspaper man heard of it and wrote an article about it, which irritated Roosevelt at first; but the publicity given the place brought victims of infantile paralysis pouring in. Many of them were desperately poor, and even for those who had money there was no proper accommodation, and no adequate professional attention. Within the next few years Roosevelt sunk half his personal fortune fixing up the place. He didn't pose as a philanthropist; as a matter of fact, when Warm Springs became an endowed foundation he got some of the money back, but, if he hadn't, it would have been all right. He knew what these poor people were facing. He had been there, too. So to put up the money seemed to him the only decent thing to do. "One thing thou lackest," said One to a rich young man. "Sell what thou hast and give to the poor." That particular story had a sad ending; but not always has the rich young man turned and gone away sorrowful.' [1]

Loyalties.

'Yorkshire has discovered,' Lord Halifax once said, 'one of the secrets at the root of life—that life was always the product of a series of concentric loyalties finding its ultimate expression in wider service to the State and humanity.

'Each and every one of these loyalties depends all the time for its vitality upon constantly making efforts to reach out far, to be and to do something bigger. . . . A nation that only thinks about itself, that has no room in its picture for the greater service of man, becomes no help to its fellow-members or to humanity.'

What is a Miracle?

Mr. R. A. Butler, President of the Board of Education, in an address to the National Union of Teachers Conference, said, 'Cynics tell me that these agelong disputes [sectarian and political differences about religious teaching in schools] are not worth tackling, but I am reminded of the recent story in *The Schoolmaster* in which a learned Rabbi told General Sikorski that in his view the war would be won either by normal methods or by a miracle. Sikorski asked whether by a miracle he meant Divine intervention. "No," the Rabbi said, "that would be the normal method. It will be a miracle if we win it by our own efforts." That is the moral of the story to-day, and it is the spirit in which we should approach this problem.'

[1] G. W. Johnson, *Roosevelt*, 101.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.